

4325 k31

Wiche
Gift of y^r Author.



A
SUPPLEMENT
TO THE
SERMONS
PREACHED AGAINST
POPERY
AT
SALTERS-HALL,
MDCCXXXV.



[Price One Shilling and Six-Pence.]

Handwritten notes at the top left of the page.

THE BRITISH MUSEUM

SUPPLEMENT

TO THE

STONES



THE

ROBERT

PRINTED

BY

THE

A
SUPPLEMENT
TO THE
SERMONS
LATELY PREACHED AT
SALTERS-HALL
AGAINST
POPERY:
IN WHICH
INFANT-SPRINKLING
IS SHEWN TO BE ANOTHER
GREAT CORRUPTION
OF THE
CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

By GRANTHAM KILLINGWORTH. *K*

The FIFTH EDITION, with the APPENDIX:

CONCERNING

THE *FIRST DAY* OF THE *WEEK*, AND
WOMENS RIGHT to the *LORD'S SUPPER*:

TOGETHER WITH AN ANSWER TO
M^r *EMLYN*'s PREVIOUS QUESTION;
AND A REPLY TO A PAMPHLET, ENTITLED,
A JUST REBUKE, &c.

L O N D O N:

Printed for J. NOON, at the *White-Hart* near *Mercers-
Chapel* in *Cheapside*. M DCC XXXVIII.





T H E
P R E F A C E

To the THIRD EDITION.

TH E R E would be no occasion for a preface to the present edition of this tract, if it did not seem expedient to take notice of some objections made against it.

Some gentlemen, I understand, find fault with the title, and think it improperly call'd a Supplement: They might not perhaps meet with what they expected in it, but I must beg leave to dissent from them as to the propriety of the title. They very well know, 'tis my opinion that infant-sprinkling is one great corruption of the church of Rome; and therefore ought to have been opposed in the late lectures against Popery; but this being wholly omitted, my design was to supply that defect, and therefore I could not think any title more suitable to my book than that which it bears. If they judge differently of infant-sprinkling, they will nevertheless allow that every author hath a right to name his book according to his own mind, and not according to the opinion of other men.

Others pretend that I have not justly quoted the catechism of the church of England, but alter'd it to serve my own purpose. This I acknowledge would be a heavy charge indeed, if it could be made good. But on the contrary, all the editions from the reign of king James I. 1604. (if not from the reformation) read the same with what I have quoted to the year 1662. when the alteration was first made in favour of sprinkling, which practice very much prevailed in the time of the civil war,[†] but was not allowed of before, only in case of necessity. If therefore they would give themselves the trouble to

consult

[†] Dr. Wall's History of infant-baptism, quart. edit. p. 472.

consult those editions, they would be convinced that their censure is very unjust. And it appears the more unreasonable, because in the present editions the answer to the same question is, WATER WHEREIN the person is baptized in the name, &c. which necessarily implies dipping, for every one must see 'tis absurd to say, Water wherein the person is sprinkled. And the ministration for publick baptism expressly says, "Then the priest shall take the child into his hands, and
 " he shall DIP IT IN THE WATER discreetly and warily, saying, &c." and for private baptism, "Then let the priest baptize it in the form before appointed for publick baptism of infants, saving that at DIPPING OF THE CHILD in the font, he shall use this form of words: If thou be not already baptized, N. I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

It has been insinuated that this Supplement was written by a Papist; and the mighty pretence for this suspicion is, that the author had not prefixed his name. But this certainly is a very insufficient reason, for 'tis well known that very good Protestants have seen cause not to print their names, even before books written against Popery. — Besides, I have so freely censured the principles and practices of the church of Rome as antichristian, and the very original of that corruption which I blame Protestants for retaining, that no man who has read my book can justly suspect it came from a Popish pen. I cannot but think therefore that the authors of this report have never read the Supplement; or talk at this rate with a design to keep others from looking into it. How they can justify their conduct in either case, I leave them to consider: but to prevent all suggestions of this kind for the future, I have set my name at length to the title-page of this edition.

Some are offended because they conceive I have given the Papists an advantage against the Protestants: I am very sorry they have any, but I am sure the good people who make this objection entirely mistake the cause of it; 'tis not my Supplement, but the practice of infant-sprinkling which has given them this advantage ever since the reformation; and they would be altogether as sensible of it as they are, tho' I had been wholly silent upon this occasion. The fact is notorious from the writings of Bellarmine, Bossuet, and other learned Papists, who have long since laid hold of it
 in

in such a manner that the Protestant divines who practise infant-sprinkling have not been able to give them a solid answer. 'Tis not my book therefore, but the practice of such Protestants, which has given Papists the advantage; nor is it my silence, but their own reformation, which can take it out of their hands. Instead therefore of finding fault with what I have done, let them reform their own practice. I am so far from having given Papists an advantage, that by closely adhering to the scripture, and renouncing all their traditions, I have effectually prevented their having any against me, or those who are of my persuasion.

But the most common objection which has been made against it is this, That it is not well timed. I must confess that I thought the reasons which were briefly assigned in the conclusion of the book, for my publishing it at the time it came out, if duly considered, would have prevented this objection. The fitness of the time was a great encouragement to me, because I judged this as good an opportunity as ever happened since the reformation to convince Pædobaptists of their error in sprinkling infants, and therefore most likely to answer my hopes of their further reformation from Popery: and if this time had been neglected, there might never happen another so good. For which reason I am so far from thinking this time improper, that it has always been my opinion, it would have been better to have publish'd it the very week after the lectures were ended: but that was impossible, for the materials were not ready for me till the sermons were printed, the last of which was upon Protestant reformation. Then I resolved to write a Supplement to them, and accordingly printed an advertisement in the Old Whig of April 24. The work indeed would have been published something sooner than it was, if another affair had not hindered; but yet I hope it was not too late. This objection being mentioned to a member of the church of England, a man of good sense, he replied, That's the very beauty of it, for it would not have been taken so much notice of at another time; and perhaps it is for this reason only that Pædobaptists say it is not well timed. However, I am sure Mr. Chandler, and every gentleman who is of his mind, and approves the last paragraph in his sermon, cannot say 'tis not well timed; for I am thereby fully justified in publishing the Supplement, not only at this time, but at any other time whatsoever. And I make

make no doubt but as Mr. Chandler hath already, so he will continue to defend what he advanced, where he says; "But as a minister of the gospel I will venture to affirm, that no time can be improper to rescue the ordinances of Christ from an abandoned prostitution, As a Protestant, I think there can be no lasting security against the tyranny of Popery, unless we thoroughly renounce all the principles of it." And therefore I may venture to add in the words of his Postscript, "Tho' the Supplement I have published may be displeasing to some, surely it cannot be so to any who are heartily in the Protestant interest, or lovers of the religion of the holy Jesus To be censured by such would give me real pain; the censures of others give me neither pain nor fear."

Since this preface to the third edition was printed, I have met with some objections of a different nature, and therefore have added an appendix in answer to them. I could wish what is there said against Mr. *Emlyn's Previous Question* may stir up some abler hand to write a more full and compleat answer to that piece. However, I shall rest satisfied, having contributed what in me lay towards preventing the increase of the notion therein advanced, which I apprehend is not only contrary to the institution of Christ and the practice of the primitive church, but also favourable to the growth of Deism.

G. KILLINGWORTH.

1 AU59



A S U P-

A
SUPPLEMENT
TO THE
SERMONS
Lately Preached at
SALTERS-HALL
AGAINST
POPERY.

HAVING read over the sermons preached at *Salters-Hall* against Popery, as they came out, I was very much pleased to observe, that, generally speaking, they were judicious, and well composed; the arguments urged against the *Romanists* strong, and, as I am fully persuaded, really unanswerable: but then at the same time I could not help taking notice, that these arguments bear full as hard on some things held and practised by those communities, of which all the gentlemen (but one) concern'd in the lectures are ministers. This must needs take off the force of their reasoning with Papists, who being urged with such arguments as equally affect their opponents, will always insinuate that those ministers do not believe their own reasons to be cogent, since they think them not sufficiently convincing, to induce their own communities to lay aside infant-sprinkling; which, upon due reflection, will appear equally liable to the same objections with the

B

other

other traditionary practices of the church of *Rome*. This consideration induced me to shew their mistake in that particular, by their own arguments, which I judged the most likely way to convince, not only the ministers themselves, but also their followers ; because their employing them against the Papists, shews they have a good opinion of their validity. And I am firmly persuaded, that if they can be induced to lay aside the practice here treated of, they may oppose Popery to more advantage another time, and urge the same arguments with a much better grace. And since I design to make use of their own arguments, I shall borrow Mr. *Barker's* introduction, which, with some little variations, will fit my purpose as well as his.

“ I therefore appear in print, not so much to disprove
 “ the truth of the positions, arguments, and quotations,
 “ which have been lately advanced in the course of ser-
 “ mons preached at *Salters-Hall* against Popery, as to let
 “ those ministers know what they are to expect on this oc-
 “ casion, which induced so many of them to engage in that
 “ business at this particular juncture. Now I may ven-
 “ ture to tell them in the general, and at present, that
 “ they may expect to hear, so far as these sermons go,
 “ their own arguments turned against them, and that their
 “ own practice of infant-sprinkling, as well as the Popish
 “ religion, is also fairly charged as one branch of the grand
 “ apostasy of the Christian church, a gross corruption of
 “ gospel simplicity, from which they have not purified
 “ themselves, but have retained, as they at first received
 “ it from such who wickedly designed to raise the autho-
 “ rity of men, upon the ruins of the authority of Christ ;
 “ and to increase their wealth, power, and grandeur in
 “ the world, at the expence of scripture truth. So odious
 “ and dangerous a thing is the church's assuming an autho-
 “ rity to alter divine institutions ; and therefore they must
 “ excuse us, who are thoroughly persuaded thereof, if we
 “ expose and treat it accordingly.

“ Yet this I will venture to say, and I would chuse to
 “ say it here, that I bear no ill-will to the persons of
 “ *Pædobaptists* ; and how ill soever I think of their
 “ way of baptizing, I pity those who practise it. They
 “ very well know, that much has been said and written
 “ by *Anti-pædobaptists* to take off the veil from their faces ;
 “ and I charitably believe, that could they get rid of the
 “ prejudices of education, they would come at more and
 better

“ better light ; if they searched the scriptures, and their
 “ enquiries were not *hindred by the meanness of the few*
 “ *professors of the truth*. And were they not prevented and
 “ intoxicated with the arts and sophistry of crafty and de-
 “ signing men, they would forsake *that unscriptural*
 “ *practise*, and readily embrace and yield obedience to the
 “ *ordinance and command of Christ*.

“ Whether *the Pædobaptist ministers and people* will at-
 “ tend to this *tract*, or no, I know not : should the one
 “ sort see fit to read, and the other *not* be discouraged
 “ from examining it, I verily believe they would see that
 “ *infant-sprinkling is not the way to please God and Christ*,
 “ any more than Popery is the surest way to salvation ;
 “ and that the *baptism of adult persons*, which they so in-
 “ juriously reject, and so freely and frequently shew a con-
 “ tempt of, is the very truth as it is in Jesus, and part of
 “ that faith which was once delivered unto the saints. In
 “ this faith we mean to confirm our own people ; it is
 “ the design of this *tract* to arm and guard Protestants
 “ against the errors and dangers of Popery, *with respect*
 “ *to baptism*. What therefore naturally arises from the
 “ subject in debate will be said freely, though I hope care
 “ will be taken not to transgress the rules of decency ;
 “ and should curiosity, or any other motive, induce either
 “ *the Pædobaptist ministers or people*, to read and consi-
 “ der what shall be said, I dare say they will have no just
 “ cause to complain, that they are not treated in this
 “ controversy either as gentlemen, or as Christians.

“ I don't know that any opportunity of conversation up-
 “ on the matters in dispute between us and *them* has been
 “ refused, when desired ; and I believe there is no suffi-
 “ cient ground to think it ever will : for we firmly be-
 “ lieve we have great advantage in this controversy in
 “ point of argument ; and this *we hope* will be proved and
 “ maintained, freely and fully, whether our adversaries
 “ care to hear it or no. For if *Pædobaptists, as well as*
 “ *the bishop of Rome*, will assume a power to alter the in-
 “ *stitutions of Christ*, which neither he nor they, nor any
 “ man in the world has a right to : if *Protestant congre-*
 “ *gations, as well as Popish councils and prelates*, will
 “ *make void the commandments of God by the traditions of*
 “ *Men*, they must expect and bear to be told on't ; and
 “ till they reform, they must stand charged with all the
 “ *blame such things deserve*. I suppose they'll complain ;
 “ but if they do, they are to be told, the fault is theirs :

“ and this will be shewn and proved to *them*, from authors and records, which all *Pædobaptists*, both Protestants and Papists, themselves allow to be approved and genuine.”

I hope none of these gentlemen can think I have been too harsh or severe hitherto; because they are the very words of Mr. *Barker*, softened as much as that little variation, which was necessary for me to make, would possibly admit. And being here come to his consideration of the connection and import of his text, I should for the present have dismiss'd him; but that I find what he says upon the latter, further useful to introduce my design.

Page 7. “ I fear lest your hearts divide and rove; I am afraid of your being unchaste and corrupted; for Christianity is plain and simple, and no impure mixtures are to be made or allowed with it: no *Jewish* observances, no human inventions, no old or new traditions: to this singly, without addition or alteration, should Christians stick and adhere; keeping to the truth as it is in Jesus, and preserving the simplicity of the gospel: not mingling it with any thing that is false and foreign to it; not concealing any part of it, or mixing any falshood with it, or wresting and perverting the true sense and meaning of it, to serve our own ends, the lusts of others, or any worldly purposes whatsoever.

“ Thus, says Mr. *Barker*, the apostle shews his own fair practice, and the false and fraudulent behaviour of his adversaries; and ought not every minister of the gospel to do the same? renouncing the hidden things of dishonesty and error, not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully, but by manifestation of the truth, commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God.”

“ From the text thus explained, Mr. *Barker* is led to observe;

“ I. The apostle's account of the gospel, or Christian revelation: it is the simplicity as it is in Christ.

“ II. The concern he expresses, lest those who are in possession of the gospel, should be corrupted from the simplicity of it; this he intimates by godly jealousy and holy fear.

“ Now this, as it gives one a pleasing, grateful view of the gospel, and engages one's heart to receive it on account

“ count of its plainness and perspicuity, its simplicity and
 “ purity; so it shews us the great duty and business espe-
 “ cially of Christian ministers, and that is, to preserve the
 “ simplicity of the gospel themselves, and to warn and
 “ fortify all under their care, against every sinful and dan-
 “ gerous corruption: and I am strangely mistaken, if *in-*
 “ *fant-sprinkling* be not a gross corruption of Christian
 “ *baptism*, and a most *manifest* departure from the simpli-
 “ city that is in Christ. The opposing therefore the
 “ growth of this, carefully watching all its motions,
 “ taking the alarm ourselves, and giving a faithful warn-
 “ ing to others, according to Mr. *Barker*, is no doubt
 “ acting in character as Christian ministers, and doing the
 “ duty of watchmen, overseers, shepherds, and stewards,
 “ who are entrusted with the rich and invaluable treasure
 “ of the gospel, and of whom it is required that they be
 “ found faithful to God and Christ, to their own souls,
 “ and the souls of others.” Now, as I am fully persua-
 ded that every private Christian is under the same obliga-
 tion, so far as he is able, I was willing to discharge my du-
 ty in this capacity, by publishing this tract, as a faithful
 warning to those ministers themselves, and to all that are
 under their care. But what proof can those ministers give
 that they are really persuaded of the perspicuity and purity
 of the gospel; how can all those excellent things be dis-
 charged, which Mr. *Barker* says are the great duty and
 business especially of Christian ministers, or what just
 claim can they have to the titles he mentions, until they
 renounce their infant-sprinkling, and subject themselves to
 the ordinance and command of the gospel as Christ himself
 fulfilled it, *setting us thereby an example that we should*
follow his steps? If therefore they believe the scriptures
 to be the word of God, given forth by his unerring Spirit
 for a rule to mankind, both of faith and practice in all re-
 ligious duties and services; let them teach and exhort their
 followers to renounce the tradition which they have receiv-
 ed, and yield an humble and sincere obedience to the pure
 and uncorrupted institution of Christ. Then may they
 secure to themselves the glorious character of unprejudiced
 seekers after, and sincere lovers of truth; faithful servants
 of Christ, and further reformers of his holy religion from
 the errors and corruptions of the anti-christian church of
Rome: which is a thing much to be hoped and prayed for;
 as Mr. *Leavesly* observes¹. And when they have done this,
 they

¹ *Leavesly on Reformation*, p. 27.

they may successfully oppose the church of *Rome*; but till then, it will be no difficulty for a *Roman-Catholick* of common abilities, to baffle them in all their arguments. For though, as Mr. *Barker* says, p. 9. and 10.

- “ 1. Many doctrines of Popery are false and absurd; and,
- “ 2. Popish worship is idolatrous; and,
- “ 3. Recommends many practices which are impious
“ and wicked;

Why ought not their doctrines to be received, and their ordinances submitted to, upon the authority and tradition of their church, in its explanation of some scriptures, as well as infant-sprinkling? Or, is the tradition and authority of the church sufficient for this, and not for other things? Are Protestants justifiable in rejecting the solemn institution of the Son of God himself, that they may keep their own tradition, and shall Papists be condemned? Shall Papists be denied the liberty to interpret or add to scripture, to maintain their opinions and practices, and shall Protestants only be allowed it? Is every thing that subverts the truths of the holy Jesus, or which leads men to practise or believe different from the purity and simplicity of the gospel, a less dishonour to God and Christ, or reproach to his word, from Protestants than from Papists? Or is there any difference between them in the sin and guilt thereof? Must the name of Papist condemn, or will the name of Protestant justify? No surely: *for there is no respect of persons with God*, Rom. ii. 11.

The argument I shall make use of against the sprinkling of infants, is, “ That no one book or parcel of scripture” teaches this practice. We have no precept nor precedent in scripture for giving baptism to any but adult persons, upon the profession of repentance and faith. Our blessed Lord in his commission says, *Goye therefore, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*, Matth. xxviii. 19. In which text to be sure infants are not included, because our Lord here maketh none the subjects of baptism but what are likewise made the subjects of instruction: as the ancient author of the *Apostolical Constitutions* well taketh notice; “ Our Lord, saith he, did in this manner exhort us, saying first, Make disciples of all nations; and then he adds this, And baptize them in the name of the Father,
“ ther,

* Mr. *Barker's* Sermon, *Papery*, &c. p. 10. * L. vii. c. 40.

“ ther, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” Which exposition of the text, as it was given before our controversy broke out, and could not therefore proceed from favour or affection to either Party ; so I take it to be more genuine than the exposition of some modern Pædobaptists, who pretend, that the *Greek* word does not signify to teach, but to disciple, or receive into discipleship, and that this is here directed to be done by baptizing them. But this certainly is a poor groundless criticism, which cannot serve the cause for which it was contrived. For tho’ it should be allowed that it signifies to receive into discipleship, yet ’tis certain he does not command them to receive new-born children as disciples by baptizing them, but only such as were capable of being taught whatsoever he commanded them. Of this new-born children are incapable, and are not therefore to be baptized.

But further, ’tis certain this is not the true signification of the word ; for it denotes here, as in all other places, to teach, or to make men disciples by teaching them, in order to prepare them for baptism, which is very largely and clearly shewn by the learned Dr. *Gale* in his reflections upon Dr. *Wall’s History of Infant Baptism*, a page or two of which I will here transcribe from *Letter 7. pag. 259.* where quoting the opinion of Dr. *Hammond* from his six *queries*, p. 196. that “ the word does not signify to teach, but to receive into discipleship, by baptism as the ceremony, without any preceding instruction ; *he adds*, And yet notwithstanding Dr. *Hammond* is so positive here, in his paraphrase and annotation he strenuously asserts the direct contrary, and thus paraphrases the words, Teach all nations the Christian doctrine, and persuade them to embrace it, and to live according to it. And in the note he has more to the same purpose. In his dissertations on episcopacy, he runs the words thus: Call to discipleship or instruct all nations in the faith and discipline, certify all of the resurrection of Christ ; and by preaching the gospel in all parts gather disciples, and those you have so gathered baptize and teach.

“ So plainly does this learned man contradict himself : upon which this remark is obvious, that when the Doctor’s mind was not immediately under the power of prejudices (which were as strong in him sometimes as in other men) and when he had no interest to serve, he
“ could

“ could see and acknowledge the truth, which the dust
 “ his prejudices rais’d, hindered him from seeing at other
 “ times.

“ But further, this answer is utterly false, and is accord-
 “ ingly disown’d by men of the greatest learning : as *Came-*
 “ *ron, Grotius, Rigaltius*, with others, whom I shall
 “ mention hereafter. Add to these the right reverend
 “ and learned bishop of *Sarum*, who in his judicious expo-
 “ sition of the articles, says thus : By the first teaching or
 “ making disciples that must go before baptism, is to be
 “ meant the convincing the world, that *JESUS* is the
 “ *CHRIST*, the true *MESSIAS* anointed of *GOD*, with
 “ fullness of *GRACE* and of the *SPIRIT* without measure,
 “ and sent to be the *SAVIOUR* and *REDEEMER* of the
 “ world. And when any were brought to acknowledge
 “ this, then they were to baptize them, to initiate them
 “ to this religion, &c. and then they led them into the
 “ water; and with no other garments, but what might
 “ cover nature, they at first laid them down in the
 “ water, as a man is laid in a grave; and then they said
 “ these words, I baptize or wash thee in the name of the
 “ *FATHER, SON* and *HPLY GHOST*. Then they raised
 “ them up again, and clean garments were put on them, &c.
 “ In this account of the method the apostles and first Chri-
 “ stians pursued, his lordship has given almost as exact a
 “ description of our practice to this day, as if he had
 “ designed to express it.

“ *Dr. Whitby* likewise, somewhat more largely, with
 “ his usual modesty and candour, corrects this mistake.
 “ *MacIntosh*, says he, here is to preach the gospel to
 “ all nations, and to engage them to believe it, in order
 “ to their profession of that faith by baptism. This he
 “ goes on to confirm, and then adds, I desire any one
 “ to tell me how the apostles could *μαθητεύειν*, make
 “ disciples of an heathen or unbelieving *Jew*, without
 “ being *μαθηταί*, or teachers of them; whether they
 “ were not sent to preach to those that could hear, and to
 “ teach them to whom they preached, that *JESUS* was
 “ the *CHRIST*, and only to baptize them when they did
 “ believe this? This is so absolutely necessary in the na-
 “ ture of the thing, till a Christian church among the hea-
 “ thens or Jews was founded, and so expressly said by
 “ *Justin Martyr* to have been the practice of the first ages
 “ of the church, that to deny what is confirmed by such
 “ evidence of reason and church history, would be to
 “ pre-

“ prejudice a cause which in my poor judgment needs not
 “ this interpretation of the word μαθητεύειν, nor needs it
 “ be asserted, that infants are made disciples, any more
 “ than they are made believers by baptism, &c.

“ I don’t see how it is possible to make any reply to
 “ this, and therefore I might be excused from adding any
 “ thing more; but because the stress of our argument
 “ from the commission lies chiefly in this word, and
 “ our adversaries generally make it their main re-
 “ source, I will the more studiously proceed to shew, be-
 “ yond question, 1. from the sense of the *Greek* word;
 “ 2. from the authority of the several versions; 3. from
 “ the opinion of the fathers; and lastly, from the scri-
 “ ptures themselves, and the practice of the apostles, that
 “ μαθητεύειν does always, and particularly in the place
 “ under consideration, signify to teach or instruct, and
 “ to make disciples only by so doing.”

To this I will add, as a direction for those who desire
 to be more fully and particularly satisfied in the sense of
 this word, part of the contents of his viiith *Letter*, p. 291,
 where he says, “ The most judicious have always allow’d,
 “ that the word in the commission particularly signifies to
 “ teach and instruct. As, *Constantine, Stephens, Leigh,*
 “ *Turretine, Episcopius, Limborch, Cameron, Martin*
 “ *Bucer, Rigaltius, Erasmus, Grotius, Lucas Brugenfis.*
 “ This proved to be the sense of the place from the se-
 “ veral versions, the *Hebrew, Syriack, Arabick, Persick,*
 “ *Ethiopick, Arias Montanus, Vulgar Latin*; that of
 “ *Sixtus V, Beza, Erasmus, Castalio, the Italian, Spa-*
 “ *nish, French, Dutch, Danish, Saxon, Vulgar Greek.*
 “ The fathers of the primitive church always understood
 “ the word in the commission signified to teach. Thus
 “ *Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, St. Justin, Eusebius,*
 “ *Apostolical Constitutions, St. Clement, Epiphanius, St.*
 “ *Basil, Tertullian, Clarus bishop of Mascula, St. Hie-*
 “ *rom.* Lastly, this is proved to be the true sense of the
 “ place by the authority of the sacred scriptures them-
 “ selves.” Which to me appears,

1st, From the practice of Christ before this commission
 was given, for he made disciples by teaching, and then
 order’d his apostles to baptize them. *John* iv. 1, 2. *The*
Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made
and baptized more disciples than John, though Jesus him-
self baptized not, but his disciples. Where we may ob-
 serve, that the Pharisees had heard of our Saviour that he

did two things, *viz.* That he made more disciples than *John*, and that he baptized more than he: the latter of which the evangelist explains, and shews that the baptizing those disciples was not his own doing personally, for Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples. But then he tacitly alloweth the former to be his own act, that when the Pharisees heard that Jesus made more disciples than *John*, he made them disciples by his own instruction. From whence I conclude, that making disciples is a different thing from baptizing them, and that it includeth instruction: and consequently those whom Jesus baptized by his disciples, were not infants, but persons who had been instructed. This passage likewise shews, that the number of disciples which Jesus made was very considerable; nor is it to be doubted but some of them had new-born children in their families; and if any of those children had been baptized by the appointment of Christ, we cannot be persuaded that a thing so material would have been omitted by all the four evangelists. From their silence therefore we conclude, that none were admitted to baptism but such as had been taught, and believed his doctrine.

2dly, This may be proved also from the parallel place in *St. Mark*, ch. xvi. *Go ye into all the world, preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.* Where the words *teach all nations* in *Matthew* are explained by the other, *preach the gospel to every creature*, in *Mark*: as Mr. Neal seemeth to allow, who alluding to the commission, instead of the words in *St. Matthew*, substituteth those in *St. Mark*, *preach the gospel*, when he says, ¹ ‘Next under him (Christ) the twelve apostles are foundations and pillars of the Christian church, who were equally commissioned to preach the gospel to all nations.’ Which exposition of *St. Mark*’s I highly prize, ‘because, as Dr. Earle says, ² one would think that *St. Mark* ... was a better interpreter of his brother *Matthew*, than all fathers and doctors put together.’

3dly, The practice of the apostles in executing this commission shews how they understood the word, and how we consequently are to understand it. They first preached Christ, and administered baptism to them only who believed. We have not one single instance of their admitting any as disciples by this ordinance before they had instructed them, much less any who were incapable of learning

¹ Mr. Neal *on the supremacy*, p. 111. ² Dr. Earle *on purgatory*, p. 40.

learning what they ought to believe and do as Christians. And as the practice of the apostles must be allowed to be the best comment on the institution of Christ; I shall proceed to give a more particular account of it from the *Acts of the Apostles*. To begin then with the first instance we have there recorded: When St. *Peter* in his sermon, just after the descent of the Holy Ghost, preached to the *Jews* faith in Christ Jesus, and many of his hearers being convinced, enquired of him and the other apostles, *Men and brethren what shall we do?* his answer is exactly conformable to the tenor of our Lord's commission, *Repent and be baptized everyone of you for the remission of sins.* And afterwards, answerably to the same commission, 'tis recorded; *Then they that gladly received the word were baptized, and the same day were added unto them about 3000 souls; and they continued stedfastly in the apostles doctrine, and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers,* Acts ii. 37 to 42. Amongst all which 3000, who gladly received the word, and continued stedfast in the apostles doctrine, there could not possibly be one infant comprehended. But can it be reasonably doubted, that in so great a number of converts, there were not many, who had children incapable of instruction, if not newly born, in their families? and yet the historian gives no account that any such children then received baptism, or that their Parents were directed to bring them to it as soon as they could. He only tells us, *Then they who gladly received the word were baptized.* But now if any such children were baptized, the omission of it in this place is unpardonable; because, as this was the first time of the apostles baptizing after they had received the commission from Christ, so it was the most proper occasion to inform us that they were baptized; by which we might know it was the will of Christ that they should be admitted to this ordinance, notwithstanding he gives no direction for it in the institution.

The same method of first teaching persons, and then baptizing them, which *Peter* made use of, was also observed by *Philip*; of whom 'tis said, *Acts* viii. 5, 6. &c. *That he went down unto the city of Samaria and preached Christ unto them; and the people with one accord gave heed unto those things which Philip spake, hearing and seeing the miracles which he did.* And then a little after 'tis taken notice of, that when they believed *Philip* preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of *Jesus Christ*, they were baptized both men and women. In particular

ticular it is said of *Simon*, That he himself believed also, and when he was baptized he continued with *Philip*, wondering and beholding the miracles and signs which were done. Here again it deserves to be remarked, that the number of believers was so great, that it may be reasonably supposed many of them had children lately born, or at least not come to years of understanding, in their families; but yet the historian gives no account of their being baptized with their parents, or afterwards, when there was a convenient time. On the contrary, *St. Luke* speaks in such a manner, as if he designed to shew us that no such children were baptized, but only such as were capable of instruction and believing. *When they believed . . . they were baptized, both men and women.* Nor do we find that *St. Peter* and *St. John*, who were sent down to *Samaria* by the apostles, gave orders to baptize the children of the new converts; but only prayed for them who had been baptized by *Philip*, on profession of faith, that they might receive the Holy Ghost.

And this same way of proceeding, directed by our Lord in his commission, *Philip* likewise observed with relation to the eunuch. For when he had asked *Philip* the meaning of a passage in *Esaias*, 'tis said, *Then Philip opened his mouth, and began at the same scripture, and preached unto him Jesus.* And as they went on their way, they came unto a certain water, and the eunuch said, *See, here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized?* And *Philip* said, *If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayst:* and he answered and said, *I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.* And he commanded the chariot to stand still, and they went down both into the water, both *Philip* and the eunuch, and he baptized him. *Acts viii. 30 to 40.* 'Tis here remarkable,

1. That a belief of the gospel of Christ from the heart, and a confession with the mouth, is necessary in every person that is received to baptism.

2. What it is that they are to believe from the heart, and to make confession of with the mouth, and that is, *That Jesus Christ is the Son of God*; which is the first and the greatest article of the Christian faith, and which our Lord declared to *Peter* [in allusion to his name] *was the rock on which he would build his church, and the gates of hell should not prevail against it.* *Matthew xvi. 16, 17, 18.* Which words of Christ have been fully verified: for against this great foundation of the Christian church,

church, hath no power been able to prevail, so as to remove it out of the *credenda*, or faith of the church. For tho' the papacy, and other apostasies, have risen up, and have defaced, corrupted and changed other doctrines and ordinances of the Christian religion, none of them have yet apostatized so far, as wholly to deface and disown this great foundation truth; being all obliged and compelled to own, *That Jesus Christ is the Son of God*. This therefore is the great stable article of our holy religion; and none ought to be, nor indeed can truly be admitted members of the Christian church, but such only as first own, or believe and confess, *That Jesus Christ is the Son of God*. This is the faith which overcometh the world: for St. *John* assures us, that *whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God, and whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith; and who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?* 1 John v. 1, 4, 5. For as the great and fundamental article of all religion is, to believe that there is a God, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him, Heb. xi. 6. so the great foundation article of the Christian religion, in contradistinction from the religion of nature, and that of the law, is to believe that JESUS CHRIST IS THE SON OF GOD, whom we are commanded to hear, *Matth.* xvii. 5. *Deut.* xviii. 15. And upon this plain, this short confession it is, that Christ hath declared he would build his church. And therefore a declaration of this was insisted upon by *Philip*, as necessary to the eunuch's being baptized, and is of course equally necessary for all other persons to qualify them for baptism; *If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest*. And when the eunuch had made a more full and more solemn confession thereof, or had again confessed this foundation article, on which the church was to be built, *Philip* received him as a subject fit for holy baptism, and worthy to be made thereby a member of the church of Christ.

The next instance is the baptism of *Saul*, after he had been convinced of the truth of our Saviour's Messiahship in an extraordinary manner; and therefore *Ananias* maketh this conviction an argument for his baptism; for he said unto him, *The God of our fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldest know his will, and shouldest see that just one, and hear the voice of his mouth, . . . And now why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy*

thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord. And he arose and was baptized. Acts ix. 18, 20. and ch. xxii. 14, 16.

This was also the method *Peter* took with *Cornelius*, and his friends: he first opened his mouth, and preached unto them a dead and risen *Jesus*; and, after the *Holy Ghost* had fallen on all them which heard the word, then answered *Peter*, *Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?* And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord. Acts x. 34. to the end.

And here, by way of digression, I shall beg leave to observe upon this passage, that nothing can be more contrary to the pretences of the *Quakers*, That the baptism of the Spirit is all which is intended in *Christ's* commission; since the apostle, who best knew the mind of *Christ*, and how to understand his laws, commanded water-baptism to be administered unto such as were already baptized with the Holy Spirit, more manifestly than ever any *Quaker* was; and especially, since this conduct of *St. Peter* is to be look'd upon not as any thing peculiar to himself, but as the act of all the apostles, who by their approbation of it made it their own act. For *Peter* related to them the whole story; and when they had heard these things, they held their peace, and glorified God, saying, *Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life,* Acts xi. 18.

But further, from this relation of *Cornelius* and his friends receiving the extraordinary effusion of the Holy Ghost, and being afterwards by the command of *St. Peter* baptized with water; there naturally ariseth a very strong and convincing argument against that pretended plea so common in the mouths of some Protestants, and which one would scarcely expect to meet with but from the Deists, it being plainly calculated for the defence of their principles, instead of promoting the Christian religion in doctrine and practice. The plea is, That positive institutions are not of binding obligation, nor of any service further than they conduce to the promotion of piety and moral virtue, and that therefore where those things are attained without them, there can be no necessity of conforming thereunto.

Answer: 1st, It ought to be considered, that *Cornelius* was a man of strict piety and virtue, which is very evident from the 2, 3, 4, 22, 30, 31 verses, *A devout man, and one that feared God with all his house, which gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God alway; unto whom*

whom the angel gave this testimony, *Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial before God*; and of whom his servants could say, *He was a just man, and one that feared God, and of good report among all the nation of the Jews*. From which texts we have reason to think he was arrived to a very high degree of piety and moral virtue. But those high attainments were so far from exempting him from being obedient to the positive institution of baptism, that on the contrary it render'd him the fitter subject, as being thereby better qualified, and more like unto the spotless purity of the Son of God, that perfect example of our imitation, who was himself obedient to the positive institution of baptism, *John i. 33. saying, Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness*, *Matth. iii. 15. Cornelius* therefore by his piety and virtue became so acceptable to God, that he vouchsafed him a special call, in order for his being obedient to the positive institution of baptism, and thereby taking upon him the religion of the holy Jesus; for *v. 4, 5, 6.* when the angel came unto him he said, *Cornelius, thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial before God; and now send men to Joppa, and call for Simon, whose surname is Peter; he shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do.* And *v. 22. Cornelius the centurion was warned of God by an holy angel to send for thee into his house, and to hear words of thee.* And *v. 31, 32.* the words of the angel are again repeated, that *Peter* should speak unto him; or as it is *ch. xi. 14. shall tell thee words whereby thou and thy house shall be saved.* *Ch. x. 33.* 'tis added, *Immediately therefore I sent for thee, and thou hast well done that thou art come.* Now therefore we are all here present before God to hear all things that are commanded thee of God. *Peter* then preached Christ unto him and his friends, urging the testimony of the prophets as a proof of his doctrine, *That to him gave all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins*: a blessing promised and made over unto all those who are sincerely obedient to the positive institution of baptism; and no persons whatsoever need to doubt of their forgiveness, if they come to it fitly qualified by repentance and faith, which appears even in the commission itself, *Mark xvi. 16. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved*: also *Acts ii. 38. Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.* So also *Ananias* to *Paul*, *Acts xxii. 16. And*

now

now why tarriest thou? *Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord.* By this we see the very great advantage which accrues to those who willingly submit to the positive institution of baptism, besides their taking upon them a publick profession of Christ's religion, and by this ordinance obliging themselves to the practice of all the duties which it recommends, by a holy and virtuous life, in imitation of the Son of God. But,

2dly, 'Tis worth observing, That as soon as *Peter* assured *Cornelius* and his friends that they should receive the remission of their sins, *the Holy Ghost fell on all them that heard the word, they spake with tongues, and magnified God*; which is the highest token and manifestation of the divine favour and acceptance which could possibly be desired; and yet this was so far from being sufficient to exempt them from baptism, that on the contrary it is urged by the apostle himself as the strongest argument for their being baptized: *Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?* ver. 43 to the end. And in *ch. xi. 17.* he thus justifies his conduct to the brethren: *For as much as God gave unto them the like gift as he did unto us who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, what was I that I could withstand God?* and therefore he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord. This plea therefore is so far from being agreeable to scripture, that if we are to judge thereof by that unerring rule, it must be rejected by all Christians, and especially by Protestants, who profess to make it their only rule and guide in religion.

Having shewn from the practice of *St. Peter* and *St. Philip*, that they did not apprehend our Lord gave them commission to baptize new-born infants, but grown persons only, who believed in him; I shall now proceed to shew that *St. Paul* understood his institution in the same manner. When he had been baptized by *Ananias*, as before related, he shewed first unto them of *Damascus*, and at *Jerusalem*, and throughout all the coasts of *Judea*, and then to the *Gentiles*, that they should repent, and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance, *Acts xxvi. 20.* Thus he preached every where, and baptized them who received his doctrine; but we find not that he any where taught the believers to bring their children to baptism, tho' he could sincerely protest to the *Ephesians*, *Acts xx. 20, 26, 27,* *That he had kept back nothing that was profitable unto them,*

them, but had shewed them, and taught them publickly and from house to house; and that he was pure from the blood of all men, for he had not shunned to declare unto them all the counsel of God. And therefore we cannot but conclude, that infant-baptism is no part of the counsel of God; for if it was so, St. Paul would have delivered it to those, who were by his ministry persuaded to believe in Christ. And as we have no account of his teaching the baptism of infants in any one of those many places where he preached the gospel, so we have no instance of his baptizing any, but such as believed. To proceed to particular cases; at *Philippi* he first taught, and then baptized *Lydia* and her household, for so the text saith: *Acts xvi. 13, 14, 15.* And on the sabbath day we went out of the city by a river-side, where prayer was wont to be made, and we sat down and spake unto the women which resorted thither. And a certain woman named *Lydia*, a seller of purple of the city of *Thyatira*, which worshipped God, heard us, whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul; and when she was baptized and her household, she besought us, saying, If ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house and abide there; and she constrained us. The word *household* does not imply that she had any children, but may only denote domesticks; or if she had children, they might be come to years of maturity, and capable of believing: and that she had none in her family but such as were grown up, is evident, because they are called *brethren*, and were capable of receiving comfort from *Paul* and *Silas*, ver. 40. And they went out of the prison, and entered into the house of *Lydia*; and when they had seen the brethren, they comforted them, and departed.

Thus also when the jailor, surprized by the earthquake, was stirred up to enquire after his future state, and came trembling, and fell down before *Paul* and *Silas*, and said, Sirs, what must I do to be saved? they answered, Believe on the Lord *Jesus Christ*, and thou shalt be saved and thy house. But as none were to be received to holy baptism, but only such as had been converted to the belief and acknowledgment of the gospel of Christ by the preaching of the same, which 'tis not likely they had ever heard, therefore, that they might all know what the faith of Christ was, and how they ought to believe on him, *Paul* and *Silas* both spake [or preached] unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house: which had the desired

and intended effect, for *he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes, and was baptized, he and all his, straitway. And when he had brought them into his house, he set meat before them, and rejoiced, believing in God with all his house.* In which passage there is not a word favouring the baptism of infants, but many circumstances, such as their having the word preached unto them, their rejoicing and believing in God, which shew that none but adult persons were baptized. And therefore how so many learned and sober persons can bring such scriptures as these for sprinkling infants, when there is not one single circumstance in them favouring that practice, but many plainly against it, is indeed surprisingly strange, and shews that the prejudices of education are very strong, and the fondness of men for the traditions they have been used to, very great.

The next instance which I shall particularly consider is, that of St. Paul's preaching and baptizing at *Corinth*, delivered by St. Luke in these words, *And he departed thence, and entered into a certain man's house named Justus, one that worshipped God, whose house joined hard to the synagogue: and Crispus the chief ruler of the synagogue believed on the Lord with all his house:* [which passage will prove that new-born infants are capable of faith, full as well as some others do that they were baptized.] *And many of the Corinthians hearing, believed and were baptized,* Acts xviii. 7, 8. It may here be noted, that St. Paul continued at *Corinth* a year and six months, and after this he tarried there yet a good while; and that he was at *Ephesus* the space of three years, Acts xviii. 11, 18. ch. xx. 31, long enough for many of the believers in both places to have children born and baptized, if there had been such a practice amongst Christians at that time: but there being a total silence upon that head throughout the whole new testament, according to Mr. Smith's, Mr. Neal's, and Dr. Hughes's reasoning, which I shall cite hereafter, is sufficient proof, that they ought not to be baptized.

The last instance I shall take notice of in the Acts of the apostles, is that of rebaptization, which we have when Paul came to *Ephesus*, ch. xix. where finding certain disciples, who had not so much as heard whether there were any Holy Ghost, having received only John's baptism, he told them, *John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance,* [or on profession thereof,] *saying unto the people that they should believe on him which should come after him,* that

that is, on Christ Jesus. When they heard this [like well-disposed persons, ready and willing to do the whole will of God, as soon as they became acquainted with it,] they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them, and they spake with tongues and prophesied. What was the reason of this procedure of the apostle; whether it was because our Lord had declared, *Matt. xvi. 18.* that he would build his church upon the confession of St. Peter, so that no persons could truly be admitted members of his church, but only those who had first been baptized upon that confession; and therefore as *John's* disciples were only baptized upon the profession of repentance, and then were instructed by him, to believe on him which should come after him; it became necessary to rebaptize them in the name of the Lord Jesus, or upon their professing to believe, *That Jesus Christ is the Son of God*; which I take to be meant by St. Luke in this place, and also in the tenth chap. where he says, *Peter commanded Cornelius and his friends to be baptized in the name of the Lord*: or whether it was because *John* baptized only in the name of the Father and of a Messiah to come; whereas Christian baptism was to be given not only in the name of the Father, and of the Son, but also of the Holy Ghost; of which those disciples had not so much as heard: or whatever else was the cause, this appears to me pretty plain, that St. Paul did give them a baptism, different from that of St. John, before he laid hands upon them¹; notwithstanding the baptism which they had received before was from heaven and not of men, and tho' it was also an act of their understanding and choice. I cannot therefore conceive how persons in our day can satisfy themselves with what was done to them in their infancy, without any knowledge or choice of their own, and without any authority from the word of God; which must therefore be a mere human tradition, built on the ruins of the institution of our Lord, and can be no way profitable to them: for nothing done as an act of religion can be acceptable to God, but what is done according to his appointment, and with a sincere intention of obedience to him. And this infants (as such) are wholly incapable of, and therefore no regard ought to be paid by any persons to what was in that state done to them; for that is manifestly setting aside the commandment of the Son of God, that they may hold

D 2

their

¹ See *Whitby's Annotations.*

their own tradition; ¹ since, as Mr. Newman says, in another case, "These things are at best but will-worship, the fancies and contrivances of . . . men, which have no foundation either in reason or scripture."

Thus have I gone through this history of the church, which both Papists and Protestants allow to be of undoubted and indisputable authority; and this, as to the subject of baptism, is entirely on our side: it giveth no colour for the baptism of infants, but sheweth that the apostles so understood our Lord's commission, as that in their opinion he intended instruction should precede baptism; the natural consequence of which is, that infants are not the proper subjects of it.

I proceed now to mention some few passages relating to our purpose from the epistles. The first of which shall be that of St. Paul to the Romans, ch. vi. 3, to 5. *Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection.* Whence 'tis easy to infer, that none but adult persons had been as yet baptized in the Roman church, when this epistle was written, which is supposed to have been in the 57th year of our Lord ².

The like is also apparent of the churches in Galatia, from St. Paul's Epistle to them, which affirms, ch. iii. 27. *That as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ; or had thereby obliged themselves to live according to his religion, which infants are incapable of doing.*

Which may also be said of what the same apostle writes to the Colossians, chap. ii. 12. *That they were buried with Christ in baptism, wherein also they were risen with him, through the faith of the operation of God who raised him from the dead.*

To which passages of St. Paul I shall only add one from St. Peter, who affirms, that baptism also now saveth us, not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God. In which text he clearly takes.

¹ Mr. Newman on merit, p. 8.

² Dr. Whitby's preface to that epistle.

takes away the foundation of pædobaptism, declaring, that *the washing of water, and putting away the filth of the flesh,* which is the whole that an infant can have of baptism, is in itself vain and unprofitable; and that no baptism but what is attended with *the answer of a good conscience*, which adult persons only are capable of, is or can be acceptable to God.

Having thus briefly shewn the grounds of our belief and practice from scripture, I shall with like brevity consider theirs who plead for and are in the practice of infant-sprinkling.

Argument I. They say baptism came in the room of circumcision; as infants were circumcised, so infants ought to be baptized.

Ans. 1. This argument is built on a very precarious foundation; for no text saith, that baptism came in the room of circumcision: *Paul* tells the *Colossians* indeed, *ch. ii. 11, 12. Ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: buried with him in baptism, wherein also you are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who raised him from the dead.* Where the Christian circumcision is called a *circumcision made without hands*, and cannot therefore be baptism, which is performed *with hands*, but rather the *circumcision of the heart*. 'Tis true the apostle says it was conferred in baptism, and consisted in a *burial* to sin in baptism: but this is far from giving the title of circumcision to the external ceremony of baptism itself, or affirming that the one succeeded in the room and stead of the other.

2dly, Moreover this argument is of no force, because if it proveth any thing, it proveth too much, *viz.* That infants ought to be baptized precisely at eight days old, and that males only ought to be baptized.

3dly, Circumcision is not a sign of any moral change or disposition in the subject, and therefore no moral disposition was required even of the adult. But baptism is a sign of our faith and repentance, and these moral dispositions are always required in scripture of them who come to baptism. And yet,

4thly, It ought to be observ'd, that when *Abraham* received a command to circumcise the adult males of his family,

mily, he had particular instructions after that to circumcise the male-infants when eight days old : but when Christ commanded the apostles to baptize them, who were made disciples by their preaching, and were capable of further instruction afterwards ; he gives no particular direction to baptize the new-born children of such converts, tho' not capable of the same instruction. Why is there not as exprefs an order for the baptizing of children in the institution of baptism, as there was for circumcising them in the institution of circumcision ? Can any good reason be given of the omission but this, That Christ did not intend infants should be baptized ?

Argument II. They urge that infants were received into covenant under the law, and had the seal of the covenant then granted to them, and that therefore they must be allowed to be in the covenant now, and to enjoy the seal of it, otherwise their privileges would be less under the gospel than they were under the law.

Ans. 1. If it be granted that circumcision was a sign of the covenant, yet it related to their inheriting the promised land only, and had no moral qualifications required ; whereas baptism, as it has the promise of spiritual blessings annexed, so it requires such moral qualifications as fit us to receive them ; and therefore was not instituted for children, who are incapable of these qualifications, but for the adult, who having incurr'd the displeasure of God by wilful sins, shall nevertheless have a right to those spiritual blessings, if they come to baptism rightly qualified.

2dly, Circumcision is never said to be a seal or sign of the covenant to infants, but only to the parents and adult persons ; and some think it was so to *Abraham* only, (*Rom. iv. 11.*) who received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith, which he had yet being uncircumcised. *Gen. xvii. 10, 11.* This is my covenant which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee ; every man-child among you shall be circumcised. And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin, and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you. Which passage sufficiently sheweth that it was to be a sign, seal, or token only to those, who were arrived to years of understanding.

3dly, Females were as much in the covenant as males, yet they had not this seal granted them, and their privileges

leges with regard to the covenant were not less than those of the males.

4thly, Many persons before the *Abrahamic* covenant were in as safe a state without any seal, as the *Jewish* infants who received circumcision.

5thly, Baptism is never call'd the seal of the covenant in scripture.

6thly, Unbaptized infants are in a safe state, since of *such*, our Lord saith, *is the kingdom of heaven*, or of God, *Matth. xix. 14. Mark x. 14. Luke xviii. 16.* The security also of unbaptized infants is clear from reason, for as *Dr. Taylor* saith¹, "As we are sure God hath not commanded infants to be baptized, so we are sure he will do them no injustice, nor damn them for what they cannot help therein."

7thly, The external advantages of the *Jewish* circumcised infants are far out-ballanc'd by the privileges which the infants of Christians enjoy, by virtue of their being born of Christian parents, and under a much better dispensation.

Argument III. They argue from the words of Christ in the gospel, *Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven; Matth. xix. 14. Mark x. 14. Luke xviii. 16.* and therefore some persons pretend there is no doubt but infants ought to be baptized.

Ans. 1. Nothing can be inferred from hence in favour of infant-baptism, unless it was plainly said, that these children were brought to Christ to be baptized, and that he did actually baptize them; but neither of these things is affirmed by any of the four evangelists: 'tis therefore meer presumption to ground infant-baptism upon scripture, which neither here nor any where else speaks of their baptism. And this, according to *Mr. Neal's*, *Mr. Smith's*, and *Dr. Hughes's* reasoning, is sufficient proof against it. The words of *Dr. Hughes* are these², "If the word of God is silent as to any act of religion, all the fathers, councils, and popes, that ever were, have no authority to bind my conscience." And again, "³ In a word, nothing must be allowed in God's worship, but what we have his warrant

¹ *Dr. Taylor Lib. of proph.*

² *Dr. Hughes, on Saints and Images, p. 30.* ³ *p. 37.*

“ rant for : so that the very silence of scripture is enough
 “ to condemn it.”

2dly, The end for which those children were brought to Christ, is very clearly exprest by the evangelist St. *Mark*, chap. x. 13. and St. *Luke*, chap. xviii. 15. *That he might touch them*, most probably in order to heal them. For this was the action which Christ used in healing the diseased ; as *when Jesus was come into Peter's house, he saw his wife's mother laid, and sick of a fever, and he touched her hand, and the fever left her*, Matth. viii. 14, 15. *and she arose and ministred unto them*. So also of the leper, *Matth. viii. 3. Mark i. 40. Luke v. 13*. Also of two blind men, *Matth. ix. 29*. and of two others, chap. xx. 34. By this also it was that he raised to life the widow's son of the city of *Nain*, *Luke vii. 14*. Thus also he healed the ear of *Malchus*, which *Simon Peter* had cut off, *Luke xxii. 51*. And therefore it seemeth not unlikely that these infants were such as were afflicted, and brought unto Christ to be touched, in order for cure ; for according to what *Matthew* saith, ver. 1, 2. in the chapter where the relation is, *Jesus was then upon the work of healing in the coasts of Judea ; and great multitudes followed him, and he healed them all*. The reason therefore why the disciples desired those who brought children, not to press too close, or too fast upon Christ, was in all likelihood, because of the multitude of grown persons who were already gotten about him to be cured ; or else because he was at that instant discoursing to the Pharisees, who had asked him a question about divorce, tempting him ; and so they were unwilling that he should either be interrupted, or incommoded. But from the children thus brought, Christ takes an occasion to teach the proud Pharisees, together with the multitude, a lesson of humility, and to shew them the necessity thereof, in order to their receiving the kingdom of God, that they might enter therein. But,

3dly, We find our Saviour did no more to those children than what was desired by those who brought them ; for St. *Matthew* only saith, *that he laid his hands upon them, and departed thence* : and St. *Mark*, *that he took them up in his arms, put his hands upon them, and blessed them*. This is all the evangelists say, and therefore it can be no manner of plea, much less a proof for infant-baptism : nor, indeed, do the learned amongst the *Pædo-baptists* pretend to any such thing from hence. Dr. *Hammond*

mond in his paraphrase saith, " And using that ceremony
 " of imposition of hands, frequent among the *Jews* in all
 " kinds of benedictions, he bestowed his blessing upon
 " them." And as the doctor is wholly silent in his pa-
 " raphrase on these texts, and says not a word of infant-bap-
 " tism, so elsewhere he says, " the arguments from this
 " text are imperfect ways of probation." Moreover,
 Dr. *Taylor's* words are also very pertinent, and so much
 to our purpose, that I cannot help taking notice of them:
 " We may say, that from the action of Christ's blessing
 " infants, to infer that they were baptized, proves no-
 " thing so much as that there is a want of better argu-
 " ments; for the conclusion would with more probability
 " be derived thus: Christ blessed children, and so dismis-
 " ed them, but baptized them not; therefore infants are
 " not to be baptized. That Christ did not baptize them,
 " is an argument sufficient, that he hath other ways to
 " bring them to heaven than by baptism. Many thousand
 " ways there are by which God can bring any reason-
 " able soul to him; but nothing is more unreasonable,
 " than because he hath tied all men of years and discre-
 " tion to this way, therefore we, of our own heads, shall
 " carry infants to him that way without his direction:
 " the conceit is poor and low, and the action consequent
 " to it bold and venturous; let him do what he pleases
 " with infants, we must not."

Argument IV. When *Peter* exhorteth his hearers to re-
 pent and be baptized for the remission of sins, he useth an
 argument to persuade them, taken from the benefit which
 would come to their children: For the promise is to you
 and to your children, *i. e.* the promise which was made
 to *Abraham*, and his seed, now reacheth to you and your
 children, that the Lord will be your covenant God. From
 whence some conclude, the children of believers are in
 covenant, and ought to be baptized.

Ans. I. These words, *the promise is unto you, and to
 your children, and to all that are afar off*, are so far from
 proving the infants of believers to be in the covenant of
 grace, (which yet if they did, would not prove that they
 ought to be baptized) that *they* speak not at all concerning
 infants, as such; but only of the posterity and children of
 those

* Dr. Hammond, Resol. to six queries, § 23.

* Dr. Taylor's Liberty of Prophecy, p. 230.

those persons to whom *Peter* was speaking, without the word itself determining whether they were newly born, or grown up to years of discretion ; for this word often signifies children of riper years, *Matthew* x. 21. *Brother shall deliver up the brother to death, and the father the child : and the children shall rise up against their parents, and cause them to be put to death.* And *Mark* xiii. 12. where you have the same text, 'tis added, as the ground of this persecution, *and ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake.* So that unless we can suppose new-born infants capable of persecuting and being persecuted on account of religion, we must allow the word signifieth the adult, as well as infant posterity of any persons. And this is assented to by *Dr. Hammond*, whose words are these ; ¹ “ If any have made use of that inconcludent argument (*viz.* “ *Acts* ii. 39.) I have nothing to say in defence of them ; the word [children] there, is really the posterity of the “ *Jews*, not particularly their infant-children.” And *Dr. Taylor* says, ² “ That by children is meant the posterity of the *Jews*, adding “ He that, “ whenever the word [children] is used in scripture, “ shall by children understand infants, must needs believe “ that in all *Israel* there were no men, but infants ; and “ if that had been true, it had been the greater wonder, “ that they should overcome the *Anakims*, and beat the “ king of *Moab*, and march so far, and discourse so well ; “ for they were all called the children of *Israel*.”

2dly, The promise here spoken of seemeth to intend the promise of the Holy Ghost, for that's what is spoken of in the verse immediately preceding ; *Acts* ii. 38, 39. *Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins ; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost : for the promise is to you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.* What promise can this be supposed to refer to, more probably than to that of the Holy Ghost, which concluded the preceding verse ? especially when a little before 'tis called the promise of the Holy Ghost, which was made by the prophet *Joel*, not only to the old and young men, servants and handmaidens, but also to their sons and daughters, exactly answerable to what *Peter* saith, *The promise is to you and to your children.*

¹ *Dr. Hammond's* Resol. of six queries, § 81.

² *Dr. Taylor's* Lib. of proph. p. 233.

3dly, Those words, *even as many as the Lord our God shall call*, clearly determine the children here spoken of to be adult, and not new-born infants, who are incapable of obeying any calls, and therefore cannot be the subjects of the call of God. For the *called* in scripture always signifies such as have heard the gospel preached, believed the same, and been obedient to it. 1 Cor. i. 26. *For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble are called.* And ch. vii. 20, 21, 22. *Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called: Art thou called, being a servant? care not for it; but if thou mayest be made free, use it rather; for he that is called in the Lord, being a servant, is the Lord's freeman: likewise also he that is called being free, is Christ's servant.* Rom. viii. 28. *And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose.*

Argument V. Is taken from the baptizing whole households, in which it is supposed there must needs be some infants: the instances are, the households of *Lydia*, the jailor; and of *Stephanus*, 1 Cor. i. 16.

Ans. 1. It cannot be concluded from hence that new-born children may be baptized, unless it was plainly said that there were such children in these families, and that these children were baptized: because every individual is not always included in the word *household*, as appears 1 Sam. i. 21, 22, 23. *And the man Elkanah and all his house went up to offer unto the Lord the yearly sacrifice and his vow. But Hannah went not up, for she said unto her husband, I will not go up until the child be weaned. So the woman abode and gave her son suck until she weaned him.* Besides, there are many families in which there are no new-born infants.

2dly, Such things are said of them who were baptized in those families, as children are not capable of, and therefore we are sure that no infants were baptized in them; which I have before shewed from the instances of *Lydia* and the jailor. And of the household of *Stephanus*, St. Paul, who baptized it, observes in his epistle to the *Corinthians*, ch. xvi. 15. *That it was the first-fruits of Achaia, and that they had addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints.* If therefore the household of *Stephanus*, in this last passage, doth not include infants, we have no reason to

suppose them included in the same expression in the former. For in the last place they are affirmed to be the *first-fruits of Achaia*, which we read of in the 18th chapter of the *Acts*; *And he entered into the house of Justus, one that worshipped God, . . . and Crispus the chief ruler of the synagogue believed on the Lord with all his house: and many of the Corinthians hearing, believed, and were baptized.* So that the household of *Stephanus* must have been believers, as well as that of *Crispus*; for we have no account of any persons being baptized there but believers. And men may as well say that the greetings and salutations sent to the households of *Aristobulus*, *Narcissus*, and *Onesiphorus*, were sent to infants, and that the salutation sent from the saints who where of *Cæsar's* household to the *Philippians*, was also sent from infants. But if what I have said satisfies not, I hope *Dr. Hammond's* opinion may be of some weight, who says of this argument¹, “ That “ to conclude infants were baptized, because households “ were mentioned so to be, is unconvincing, and without demonstration; it being so uncertain whether there “ were any child in the families.”

However, I cannot help taking notice, that these places no way countenance their opinion, who suppose that infants of believers have a right to baptism on account of their parents faith, as being born in the covenant, and virtually holy, as they term it. For on supposition that *Lydia*, the jailor, and *Stephanus*, had any infants in their families who were baptized, 'tis certain they were born before their parents were believers; since it is evident that *Lydia* and her household were all baptized together, and so also was the jailor and all his house, and the household of *Stephanus*, who were the first-fruits of *Achaia*.

Argument VI. 'Tis argued, that infants have a right to baptism, because the apostle, *1 Cor. vii. 14.* saith, *The unbelieving husband is sanctified by the believing wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the believing husband; else were your children unclean, but now are they holy.*

Answ. I shall not enter into any particular examination of the true and genuine sense of these words, but shall content my self to shew in general, that let the holiness which the apostle speaketh of be what it will, it cannot give

¹ *Dr. Hammond's Resol. six Queries con. I. B. § 21. p. 471.*

give any right to baptism ; which appeareth from hence, that not only the children are said to be made holy, but this holiness also is derived from the sanctification of the unbelieving party, or from the holiness of the unbeliever derived from the believer ; for the apostle declareth, unless the unbelieving party were sanctified, or made holy, by the believing, the children would not be holy : but the holiness of the unbelieving party giveth him or her no right to baptism ; and therefore the holiness of the child, which is derived therefrom, cannot give it a right to baptism. For 'tis plain, the unbelieving parents cannot derive to the child that holiness which giveth a right to baptism, because they have no such baptismal holiness themselves.

My sense of these arguments cannot be better expressed than in the words of Mr. Neal, with little variation :
 “ Had our Lord, or his apostles, appointed it, we might expect to meet not only with the name in scripture, but with the [*express institution*] in the most plain and significant words ; or at least, that it should be read in every page of antiquity : but if the most ancient fathers² of the church consent in any thing, it is in a general silence about this matter. The whole stress of the evidence is therefore laid upon obscure and metaphorical passages of scripture.” He thinks it a good argument in another case, ³ “ That there is not the least mention of such a *practice* in scripture.” And a little lower he asks this question, “ But is any thing like this recorded in the whole new testament ?” But above all the rest, Dr. Earle best expresses my thoughts on this subject. ⁴ “ And here I frankly own, that all the arguments I have offered must be given up, if it has plain scripture to support it.” And page 31. “ In like manner, if it appeared from plain scripture, I say plain scripture, and not from a few dark texts, wrested to serve a turn, and which no man would have ever thought to be to the purpose, if he had not first taken the doctrine for granted. And this I verily believe to be the case. The *Pædobaptists* saw fit for several considerations, to enact the belief of infant-baptism, and then all the wit of their ablest men was
 “ employed,

² Mr. Neal on the supremacy, p. 9.

³ By the most ancient fathers, I mean those of the two first cent.

⁴ Mr. Neal *ib.* p. 17. ⁴ Dr. Earle on Purgatory, p. 30.

“ employed, to search for scriptures that might support it.
 “ Were not this the bottom of the business, could they
 “ possibly produce so many texts, that are evidently no-
 “ thing to the purpose ?” In which passage, I have only
 substituted Pædobaptists instead of the *Roman* church,
 and infant-baptism in the room of purgatory ; and the
 passage, in my opinion, fits this place as well as that which
 it filled in the doctor’s sermon.

But perhaps, Protestants who plead for pædobaptism,
 think they have a right to demand plain express texts of
 scripture from the Papists, and may themselves make use
 of dark, obscure, and metaphorical passages against the
 Antipædobaptists : but then this I am sure of, that if ar-
 guments from dark and obscure passages, may possibly be
 of force, yet the Pædobaptists arguments can be of no
 weight in this case, because, as Dr. *Earle* saith of the *Ro-*
manists reasoning for purgatory, they are nothing to the
 purpose.

Some Pædobaptists, indeed, seem conscious to them-
 selves that they have no clear scripture-proof for their pra-
 ctice, and therefore derive their infant-baptism from the
Jews. They say, the *Jews* did not only initiate their
 proselytes by baptism, but also baptized their children at
 the same time, tho’ newly born ; from hence they con-
 clude, that such children ought to be admitted into the
 christian church by baptism. But certainly ’tis no sign
 of a good cause, when men cannot support their practice
 by scripture, but are forced to have recourse to a fabulous
 tradition of the *Jews*. In answer to this plea we say,

First, That ’tis very uncertain whether the *Jews* ever
 had such a custom in our Saviour’s time.

Secondly, That if they had, ’tis not probable our Savi-
 our would have borrowed one of his institutions from it.

’ *First*, “ That the *Jews* did, in our Saviour’s time,
 “ initiate proselytes, and their children, by baptism,
 “ which is the main point of all, is a very precarious and
 “ doubtful supposition, at best. For 1st, It stands en-
 “ tirely upon the credit of a certain order of men for-
 “ merly amongst the *Jews*, called the *Gemarists*, who
 “ are represented by all who read them, even their great-
 “ est

’ Dr. John Gale’s *Sermons*, Vol. II. p. 219, &c.

“ est admirers, to be the most injudicious, fabulous, and ignorant corrupters of all history, scripture and religion. But,

“ 2^{dly}, It may be observed, that even this Talmud was not compiled till about the beginning of the sixth century, at soonest, and some learned men think not till much later: . . . *which* authority, were it otherwise ever so valuable and unexceptionable, is much too late to assure us what was the practice in our Saviour’s time, *i. e.* five hundred years before. But,

“ 3^{dly}, ’Tis highly probable they had at that time no such practice, nor long after. For first, the scriptures no where mention, nor in the least allude to any such practice, which yet they would probably have done, had there been any such usage amongst them, and especially our Saviour having, as is supposed, transplanted it into his church. Secondly, *Philo* and *Josephus*, who wrote in the apostles time several large treatises, and many things concerning the antiquities, ceremonies, and customs of the *Jews*, and had many opportunities of mentioning their custom of baptizing, had they known of it, yet do not so much as hint at it. Add to this, thirdly, that some *Jews* denied it to have been practised at that time. And then, fourthly, that this custom is never once mentioned by any of the antient writers, particularly by *Barnabas*, (who was himself a *Jew*) tho’ he wrote an epistle entirely upon the *Jewish* rites, but has not one word of this pretended *Jewish* baptism. Where the apostles are but occasionally mentioned, he does not forget to observe, that our Lord chose twelve, in some allusion to the twelve tribes. And when he is directly looking into the *Jewish* usages for some preludes of baptism, he mentions some passages in the prophets, which he applies to baptism; but never once gives the least room to imagine he knew of any initiatory baptism usually given to proselytes: and yet how could he omit this, if Christ had so certainly taken his baptism from it?”

It may be also added, that we have several passages in the gospels, which make it pretty certain that they had no such baptism. For,

1st, This appears in some measure from the surname of *Baptist* given unto *John*, which very name plainly implies that he was the first who set up the practice.

2^{dly},

2dly, His declaring, that he was sent of *God to baptize with water*, John i. 33. seems likewise to shew that he was the first who had a commission from God to baptize, and consequently that there was no such initiatory ordinance of divine appointment before.

3dly, When the *Jews* asked him, and said unto him, *Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet?* John i. 19, to 28. it manifestly imports that it was a new ordinance; for the sense of these words may be thus expressed, "Thou therefore hast no power, nor any thing to do to introduce new laws and ordinances among us, nor to call upon us to repent and be baptized. For God hath promised to raise up unto us a prophet, or law-giver, whom we are to hearken unto; and therefore, if thou be not the Christ, as thou ownest that thou art not, nor *Elias*, nor that prophet, why then dost thou baptize? For Christ only hath a right to set up new institutions." If therefore baptism had been used among the *Jews*, in receiving their proselytes, they would not have sent priests and Levites, to enquire of him whether he were the Christ, for this Reason, because he baptized; which plainly shews that it was a new practice. Nor is it likely they would so generally have gone out to be baptized of him. Would they not rather have despised him, for pretending to preach to, and call upon them, the seed of *Abraham*, to obey or conform to that which was only fit and needful for the proselytes to their religion; and more especially when the Baptist rejected them, and upbraided them, bidding them bring forth fruits meet for repentance, and not to think within themselves, that because they had *Abraham* to their father, they were, as such, fitted and qualified for every duty? *Matthew* iii. 1, to 9.

4thly, It may be gathered that there was no such practice of baptizing persons among the *Jews*, before the days of *John*, from the answer which he made to those who were sent or came to him upon his beginning to baptize, *Luke* iii. 15, 16. *And as all the people were in expectation, and all men mused in their hearts of John, whether he were the Christ or not; John answered saying unto them all, I INDEED BAPTIZE YOU WITH WATER; from whence indeed you have some reason to think that I am the Christ: But one that is mightier than I cometh, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose; he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.* Which last

last words are thus paraphrased by Dr. Hammond, "Over
 " and above the receiving of profelytes with water in bap-
 " tism, he shall send down the Spirit on his disciples in
 " an appearance as of fire, *Acts* ii. &c." Compare also
 this text with *Matth.* iii. 11. *Mark* i. 8. *John* i. 19. to 27.

5thly, It may also be inferred from our Lord's words
Luke vii. 27, 29, 30. that baptism was a new practice,
 first set up by *John* as appointed of God, where he says,
This is he of whom it is written, Behold I send my messen-
ger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee
..... And all the people that heard him, and the Publi-
cans justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John.
But the Pharisees and Lawyers rejected the counsel of God
against themselves, being not baptized of him. Which
 seems also to be intimated *Matth.* xxi. 32.

6thly, When our Saviour asked the *Jews* this question,
Matth. xxi. 25, 26, 27. *The baptism of John, whence*
was it, from heaven or of men? If it had been a custom
 amongst the *Jews* to baptize their profelytes, the question
 had been very improper, no way suitable to the design of
 our Saviour, nor to the occasion of propounding it to them;
 but, on the contrary, would rather have argued great
 ignorance, and given his enemies an opportunity to deride
 him, which was what they sought for; and the chief
 priests and the elders would then have found no difficulty
 in answering it, since it would have been easy to have said,
 that it was derived from a tradition of their own. But
 our Saviour, knowing that it was *from heaven, and not*
of men, propounded it to them; and they being conscious
 to themselves that they had not believed nor hearkened
 to *John*, and also well knowing and considering that
 it was *not of men*; that is, was not in use amongst them,
 nor practised at all before *John's* time, *durst not say of*
men, for fear of the people, who all looked upon John as a
prophet sent of God, and believed as such he had received
 from God power and authority to introduce and set up the
 practice of baptism, which was not known amongst them
 before; and therefore the priests, &c. said, *we cannot tell.*
 Which very confession proves plain enough that it was
 not one of their traditions; the supposition of which is
 not only contrary to these scriptures, and dishonourable
 to Christ and the Christian religion in general, but it is
 also unworthy of the Divine Being, to send forth one of
 the greatest of his prophets, *Matth.* xi. 11. *Luke* i. 76.
 the forerunner of his son *Jesus*, to preach and teach only
 an old human invention, which by tradition his people had

received before, and was then in the practice of. This had been giving a sanction to human inventions and corrupt traditions: which is so very unworthy of God, and so contrary to the divine perfections of an infinitely wise legislator, that the story ought rather to be looked upon as an invention of the unbelieving *Jews* to expose and disgrace Christianity; as if the sacred institution of baptism, which the Christians so religiously observed, was only an old tradition or ceremony of the *Jewish* religion in receiving their proselytes: and this was a most powerful argument to keep their followers from embracing the gospel. With these views, and for these ends only, I believe the story was first invented; and very sorry I am that Christians of any denomination should so readily give into it. I am very sure it can never credit the cause in general, however some may imagine that it serves to support their own tradition, and their corruption of that holy institution of baptism, which in its first rise was from heaven.

“ *Secondly,* ¹ But allowing that the *Jews* had such a baptism at that time, ’tis very unlikely our Lord would have adopted it into his religion, since this practice of the *Jews* was not built upon *Moses* and the prophets, and there is no foundation for it in scripture: this even the *Jews* themselves confess: it is then at most no better than one of the traditions of the elders; and we know what regard our Saviour used to teach his disciples to shew to them; he frequently inveighed against those things with more warmth than he used upon other occasions, particularly against the many washings introduced and practised amongst those hypocrites: and is it possible after this to imagine, either that he designed, or that his apostles could possibly suppose he designed, that the solemn commission he gave them was to be understood conformably to the usages of those hypocrites he had so severely censur’d? ’Tis not at all likely our Saviour should intend this; but I think it almost certain that the apostles would not do that, and go about to interpret a general law of their Lord, by the perverse groundless customs and usages of such as were his bitterest enemies, especially as to the point of baptism; he having in his life-time objected so much, particularly, against their traditionary washings. And for any now, only by the meer force and power of a strong imagination,

“ and

¹ Dr. John Gale’s Sermons, Vol. II. p. 173.

“ and without any other ground, to suppose that the apostles
 “ and first Christians did thus, is to express a mighty fond-
 “ ness for their own prejudices, and to assume a most unac-
 “ countable liberty of feigning and affirming whatever they
 “ please, and to cast a gross calumny upon those holy men.”

Moreover, when our Saviour supposeth that *John's baptism was from heaven, and not from men*, and calleth this ordinance, as administered by *John, righteousness*; he plainly supposeth it to owe its original to a divine institution, and not to human invention.

To all that we have said upon this head of *Jewish* tradition Mr. *Barker* fully agrees, when he saith, “ I fear
 “ lest your hearts divide and rove, I am afraid of your be-
 “ ing unchaste and corrupted. Christianity is plain and
 “ simple, and no impure mixtures are to be made or al-
 “ lowed with it; NO JEWISH OBSERVANCES, NO HU-
 “ MAN INVENTIONS, NO OLD OR NEW TRADITIONS:
 “ to this singly, without addition or alteration, should
 “ Christians stick and adhere, keeping to the truth as it is
 “ in *Jesus*, and preserving the simplicity of the gospel,
 “ not mingling it with any thing that is false and foreign
 “ to it, not concealing any part of it, or mixing any fal-
 “ hood with it, or wresting and perverting the true sense
 “ and meaning of it, to serve our own ends, the lusts of
 “ others, or any worldly purposes whatsoever.” ’Tis evi-
 dent that Mr. *Barker* did not think Christian baptism a
Jewish observance, or an human invention and old tradition
 in its original; but that he believed it to be of divine insti-
 tution: and therefore he cannot be supposed to derive infant-
 baptism from the *Jewish* fable of baptizing their proselytes.

Having thus considered the subjects of baptism, and shewn from the new testament that they can only be adult persons, upon their profession of repentance and faith; I shall now shew that immersion of the whole body into water is the mode of baptizing, and that the sprinkling a little water on the face is not sufficient: which is no less evident from the following scriptures.

1. *Then went out to John Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan; and were baptized of him IN JORDAN, confessing their sins.* Matth. iii. 5, 6.

2. *There went out to him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him IN THE*

F 2

RIVER

* Mr. *Barker's* Sermon, p. 7, 8.

RIVER OF JORDAN, confessing their sins. Mark i. 4, 5.

3. And John also was baptizing in ENON, near to Salim, because there was MUCH WATER there: and they came, and were baptized. John iii. 23.

4. And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee: and was baptized of John IN JORDAN; and straitway COMING UP OUT OF THE WATER he saw the heavens opened, and the Spirit like a dove descending upon him: and there came a voice from heaven, saying, Thou art my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased. Mark i. 9, 10, 11.

5. Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him. But John forbad him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? And Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it to be so now; for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness. Then he suffered him; and Jesus, when he was baptized, WENT UP STRAITWAY OUT OF THE WATER; and lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him. And lo, a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased. Matth. iii. 13, 14, 15, 16, 17.

Now tho' I apprehend that nobody who considers can well mistake the sense of these scriptures, which clearly represent John the administrator, and Jesus who was baptized of him, as both entering into the river; yet I will give the learned Dr. Hammond's paraphrase on Matth. iii. 16. and Mark i. 10. " For Jesus as soon as he was baptized " went out of the water before John, and as soon as ever " he came out of the water (as he came up from the river) " he fell down on his knees in prayer to his father, (Luke " iii. 12.) and whilst he was praying, behold the heavens, " either really or after some remarkable manner of appearance, parted asunder visibly before Christ, and the Spirit of God descended upon him, as a dove descends upon any thing, visibly hovering and lighting upon him: " and John Baptist saw and discerned what was done."

6. And as they (Philip and the eunuch) went on their way, they came unto a certain water; and the eunuch said, See, here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized?.... and he commanded the chariot to stand still: and [then in pursuance of Christ's commission, and according to the great example of the Son of God himself,] THEY WENT DOWN BOTH INTO THE WATER, BOTH PHILIP AND THE EUNUCH, AND HE BAPTIZED HIM; AND WHEN THEY

THEY WERE COME UP OUT OF THE WATER, *the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, that the eunuch saw him no more*, Acts viii. 36, 38, 39. This example sheweth what mode of baptizing was practised, not only by *John*, but also by the apostles, after they were filled with the Holy Ghost, and endowed with the Spirit of God, or power from on high. And no other mode will suit with the apostles reasonings and allusions, in the following passages of scripture.

7. *What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid: How shall we, who are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection.* Rom. vi. 1,---5. A remarkable passage this! in which what in one verse is called by the apostle *a being baptized into his death*, is explain'd, by *a being planted together in the likeness of his death, and buried with him by baptism into death*. The whole text plainly shews that his design was to intimate, that the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ were represented very fitly in baptism: and if this be true, then we must conclude that in the apostles time aspersions was not used, in which nothing of a death, burial, or resurrection, is represented; but immersion only, which in a very lively manner representeth his descent into the grave, and resurrection from thence.

8. The like may be inferred from St. *Paul's* saying to the *Colossians*, in allusion to the same mode, *that they were buried with Christ in baptism, wherein also they were risen with him*. Coloss. ii. 12.

9. Moreover, St. *Peter* speaking of baptism calleth that part of it which will not save us, *the putting away the filth of the flesh*; which is not to be effected by sprinkling, but by immersion. 1 *Pet.* iii. 21.

The same may also be argued from those passages where-in baptism is either mentioned under the name of *washing of water*, Eph. v. 26. Heb. x. 22. or the *washing of regeneration*, Titus iii. 5; for immersion is one mode of washing, but sprinkling is not.

And of the ordinance of baptism as performed by immersion in obedience to the divine command, it is worthy

our observation that Christ saith, *Matth. iii. 15, 16. Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.* Whence we see that our Lord thought so well of this ordinance of baptism, when done in obedience to God, as to dignify it with this glorious title and character; and that it hath the highest approbation of the Son of God, both from his words and example: and therefore we may well say of the sprinkling of infants, who cannot act in obedience to God, and of any thing else not commanded by him, as Dr. Earle does, ¹ “Away with all things that pretend to be substituted in the room of righteousness.” This mode also hath fresh honour added to it, for as much as the most high God declared the submission of his only Son thereto acceptable to himself, when he said, *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And the heavens were opened unto him, and the Spirit of God descended, and did light upon him, Matth. iii. 16, 17.*

Thus have I shewn from scripture the true subject and mode of baptism: with regard to both which, we have the confession of the church of *England*: in her catechism,² after having set forth the meaning of the word sacrament, the next question is,

How many parts be there in a sacrament?

Ans. Two, the outward and visible sign, and the inward and spiritual grace.³

Quest. What is the outward and visible sign, or form, in baptism?

Ans. Water, wherein the person baptized is dipped, &c.

Quest. What is the inward and spiritual grace?

Ans. A death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness, &c.

Quest.

¹ Dr. Earle on Purgatory, p. 51.

² Rob. Barker's Edition, printed 1634.

³ To this agree the assembly of divines in their catechism, with this addition to the first part, used according to Christ's own appointment: with which also exceedingly well accords what Dr. Harris says in his sermon on transubstantiation, page the 12th, “The nature of a sacrament requires this, which is allowed to be “a visible, sensible sign of a spiritual blessing and benefit. There “is always something sensible, to represent something spiritual; so “water in baptism signifies the washing away our sins, and the “answer of a good conscience towards God.” Which no way conflicts with their practice, but condemns it.

Quest. What is required of persons to be baptized?

Ans. Repentance, whereby they forsake sin; and faith, whereby they stedfastly believe the promises of God, made to them in that sacrament.

But as to the contrary practice, I affirm, in the words of Mr. Neal,¹ "There is not the least mention of *it* in "scripture; nor is there any thing like *it* in the whole "new testament. Surely St. Paul must have been guilty "of a very great omission . . . not to mention it." But 'tis not credible St. Paul could be guilty of such an omission; for he saith to the elders of Ephesus, *I have kept back nothing that was profitable to you, but have shewed you.* And again, *I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God,* Acts xx. 20, 27. If Mr. Neal thinks this good reasoning, he cannot refuse it when urged against himself; for infant-sprinkling is hardly to be supposed any apostolic practice, or institution, since the scripture is so silent about it. For, as Mr. Smith well observes, with regard to another point,² "If this was the case, methinks "the apostles should have taken care to leave it upon record, or at least to have given us some hint [of it] in "scripture." For, as Mr. Chandler says,³ "We have "no full and certain account of the doctrine taught by "Christ and his apostles, but from the records of the new "testament; and as these contain the whole revelation of "the gospel, all that we are to believe and practise as "Christians, 'tis an undeniable consequence, that we can "no otherwise demonstrate our subjection and fidelity to "Christ as Lord and Law-giver in his church, than by "our care in acquainting ourselves with the sacred records "of truth, and religiously adhering to them as the only "rule and standard of our faith and worship; ⁴ the adhering to which is an essential note of the Christian church. "This ⁵ therefore is the only true antiquity, to which, as "Christians, we are to appeal." And according to Dr. Wright,⁶ "The church of God, the true church of Christ "throughout all nations, is built entirely upon the scriptures." To which Dr. Harris and the rest with one consent agree; as appears in the following passages. "⁷ We "acknowledge

¹ Mr. Neal on the Supremacy, p. 17.

² Mr. Smith on Authority, &c. p. 31.

³ Mr. Chandler, The Notes, &c. p. 13.

⁴ 15. ⁵ 21.

⁶ Dr. Wright on Scrip. and Trad. p. 10.

⁷ Dr. Harris on Transubstan. p. 31.

“ acknowledge nothing as an authoritative rule of faith,
 “ but the scriptures, the great charter of the Christian
 “ church.” “¹ The holy scripture, and that is the reli-
 “ gion of Protestants.” “² Whose religion is scripture
 “ alone.” “³ The great rule to direct us how we are to
 “ worship God.” “⁴ For the scriptures teach us the duty
 “ God requires of men.” “⁵ And we own it to be our
 “ only and entire rule.” “⁶ The Christian church is pro-
 “ perly represented as one body, or a society, incorporate
 “ by the charter of the gospel under Jesus Christ as supreme
 “ head and governor.” “⁷ The worship of God is a first
 “ and principal duty of the law of nature, and of all re-
 “ ligion: to worship God according to the directions of
 “ the Christian revelation, is a chief duty of Christianity.”
 For, as Mr. *Leavesly* says, “⁸ Christ and his apostles, by
 “ preaching and delivering the gospel truth, and by warn-
 “ ing us of false apostles and deceitful workers, call all men
 “ every where to adhere to the truth, as it is in Jesus. . . .
 “ Now should we neglect his call, or corrupt his institu-
 “ tions, we tremble at the anathema that would then in-
 “ deed belong to us, &c.” It therefore plainly follows, as
 Dr. *Hughes* very well takes notice, “ That⁹ in all our dis-
 “ quisitions about religion, we are to consider the blessed
 “ God as the rector of the world, who has an unquestion-
 “ able right to prescribe laws to his rational creatures:
 “ these laws, sufficiently notified, we are bound to obey.
 “ Accordingly, God has revealed his mind to man in the
 “ sacred scriptures, those standing oracles of our holy
 “ religion. Whatever institutions we meet with there,
 “ as appointed by God, we are religiously to comply with:
 “ whatever else is appointed by others, if it have no foun-
 “ dation in the word of God, we are so far from being
 “ obliged to the practice of it, that in honour to God we
 “ ought to protest against it, as a bold usurpation of the
 “ divine authority.” And a little further he maketh this
 just observation, “¹⁰ In a word, nothing must be allowed
 “ in God’s worship, but what we have his warrant for;
 “ fo

¹ Dr. Earle on Purgatory, p. 29.

² Dr. Hunt on Penance, &c. p. 34.

³ Mr. Bayes on Worship, &c. p. 42.

⁴ Mr. Barker’s Popery the great, &c. p. 13.

⁵ Mr. Newman on Merit, p. 4.

⁶ Mr. Lowman on Schism, p. 12. ⁷ p. 26.

⁸ Mr. Leavesly on Reformation, p. 36, 37.

⁹ Dr. Hughes on Ven. of Saints, &c. p. 35. ¹⁰ p. 37.

“ so that the very silence of scripture is enough to condemn the praying to saints.”

And assuredly, if the silence of scripture condemneth the *praying to saints*, it must equally condemn *infant-sprinkling*. For an argument which is sufficient in the one case, cannot be insufficient when urged in the other; and therefore I would desire all of his persuasion to take the good and useful advice he giveth them, ¹ “ Let us closely adhere to the scriptures: we should take all our directions from that unerring guide; make it the rule of our faith, our worship, and our lives. And let us always bear our testimony against any additions made to it; or any thing in the worship of God appointed only by fallible men.” Which is the only way to preserve the holy Christian religion free from all human mixtures and corruptions whatsoever.

Since then the sacred records speak only of the baptism of adult persons, and that performed by immersion, as the appointment of God, the only way made use of by the apostles in their days; I know not how any communities of men, pretending to be Christians, and to make the scriptures the only rule and standard of their faith and worship, dare yet presume to change the whole ordinance, substituting infants instead of adult persons, and sprinkling instead of immersion. For as Mr. *Bayes* saith,² “ If the worship of God in the common and vulgar tongue was the practice of our blessed Saviour and his apostles, and of Christians for many hundred years after their days, I see not what right the church of *Rome*, [*or any other church whatsoever*] had to alter it.” ’Tis easy to apply this passage to our purpose: for I know not of any church which hath more right to alter the institutions of Christ, than the *Roman* church; tho’ perhaps Protestants will be more favourable and indulgent to their own churches, and their errors, than to the church of *Rome*, and her corruptions. But for my part, I wou’d always follow the excellent advice of Dr. *Hughes*, “ and ³ bear my testimony against any additions made to the scripture; or any thing in the worship of God, appointed only by fallible men.” And I heartily wish things were come to this point, that Protestant dissenting ministers, of all denominations, would bear their testimony, not only against the worship of images, but against infant-sprinkling, and all other inventions of fallible men, whether found amongst Papists, or their own parties; and return to a strict

G

observation

¹ Dr. Hughes on Saints and Images, p. 57.

² Mr. Bayes on Worship, &c. p. 44.

³ Dr. Hughes, *ibid*.

observation of all the ordinances of Christ, as at first instituted. This would be rooting out Popery from amongst ourselves, where I think a reformation should always begin. For as Mr. *Leavevly* says,¹ “ If there be any true logick or reasoning in the world, we must conclude, that a reformation from such a disordered state of religion is necessary for all those who would please and honour God, and adhere to Jesus Christ.” And page 13, he says, “ Reformation itself has two essential and comprehensive parts :
 “ 1. Detecting and disclaiming, renouncing and forsaking all false authority, and every corruption of the pure institutions of religion, which we have received from God.” And a little lower,² “ Whatever therefore opposes this great design of Christ’s coming, is to be resisted; we must depart from it, and protest against it.

“ 2. The second part of reformation is an actual return to that simplicity of subjection and obedience, that we owe only to the great author and finisher of our faith. He came to reform the world, and lead men back to the right ways of God, which he hath impressed on the conscience, and published by his prophets, and messengers, and ambassadors to the world.” And again,³ “ Thus he [bishop *Jewel*] reasonably expostulates, and makes it evident, that corruptions in religion must not be suffered to go on without observation and detection, without opposition and reformation : that we may reform ourselves in *England*, and that every country, city, or church, may do so, without getting a licence from the pope and a council. Must the word and commands of God, which we are sure are his, and the gospel of Christ, stay for letters of commendation from them? Must we ask leave of any mortal man, to open our eyes, to use our understanding, to seek God and worship him, as our conscience directs, and he commands? . . . These demands are impious, and shocking to those that read the new testament, and believe the sufficiency and faithfulness of the apostles of Christ, in delivering to us all things they had received of him, and declaring to us the whole counsel of God.”

And besides what has been quoted, there is a very remarkable passage or two of Mr. *Chandler*’s, against innovators in religious matters, who alter and pervert the gospel. For he says,⁴ “ One essential and unalterable mark or note
 “ of

¹ Mr. *Leavevly* on Reformation, p: 6. ² p. 14. ³ p. 22.

⁴ Mr. *Chandler* on the Notes of the Church, p. 11.

“ of a Christian church or congregation (*is*) the constant
 “ and firm adherence of all the members of it to Jesus
 “ Christ, as the common head, and Lord, and Saviour of
 “ Christians, and the submitting themselves wholly and en-
 “ tirely to his influence and direction ; even as the members
 “ of a natural body are guided and acted by its natural
 “ head.” And page 15, he affirms, “ That as far as men
 “ depart from the doctrine of Christ and his apostles, so far
 “ they cease to be members of the church of Christ, and
 “ are to be marked and avoided by all the faithful.” In
 “ page 17, he says, “ However, we have one sure rule to
 “ go by, and may certainly conclude who are not of the
 “ church of Christ, *viz.* those who openly and avowedly
 “ pervert and corrupt the simplicity of the Christian faith,
 “ by teaching doctrines absolutely subversive of the nature
 “ and design of it.” If this be too severe to be applied to
 the present case, yet it ought to caution every society of
 Christians, to be very strict in adhering to the institutions of
 Christ, that they may in no respect deserve any part of
 that charge, which is so justly, as well as severely, laid to
 the Papists. For is there no harm in making any altera-
 tions, but such as wholly subvert the nature and design of
 Christianity? Are we not to avoid such as subvert the nature
 and design of any particular institution of religion? And
 has not this been grossly done by Papists, in the ordinance
 of baptism, as well as in other things, by substituting in-
 fant-sprinkling in the room and stead of the immersion of
 adult persons, upon profession of repentance and faith? For
 is not baptism a gospel institution? Is it not a perverting
 and corrupting the simplicity of that ordinance, to alter the
 mode from dipping to sprinkling? Is not that, and the
 change of the subject, a subverting the nature and end of
 it, as a proper symbol of persons dying unto sin, and a
 voluntary engagement to walk in newness of life? We
 should therefore avoid these innovations, and restore true
 Christian baptism, that we may come up to that definition
 of a church, which the ministers of all denominations are
 obliged to subscribe,¹ “ The visible church of Christ is a
 “ congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of
 “ God is preached, and the sacraments be duly admini-
 “ stred, according to Christ’s ordinance, in all those things
 “ that of necessity are requisite to the same.” And if what
 Mr. *Chandler* has asserted in page 15, of his sermon, be
 true, we may thence infer, that there can be no true Chri-
 stian

¹ *The XIXth Article of the Church of England.*

stian church, without true Christian baptism; and if true Christian baptism is only that of adult persons, by immersion, upon their profession of repentance and faith arising from a self-consciousness of what they have done, and of what God requires of them; then consequently, without having this baptism, no man can rightly be a member of the true visible church of Christ. I have fairly drawn the inference, but shall leave Mr. *Chandler* to maintain his proposition. It belongs to him, and the other ministers, to defend their own arguments, which, if they chuse to retract, rather than abide by the consequence, they will then give the Romanists all the advantages which they can desire. But so much the more inexcusable is the alteration made in this ordinance of Christian baptism; forasmuch as they who practise it, are obliged, tho' infant-sprinkling is a mere human invention, solemnly to name over the child the name of the Lord, saying, with much absurdity, and little truth, I baptize thee, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: a thing, which unless they are persuaded of its being a divine institution, one would think they hardly could prevail on themselves to do. And yet that they can bring themselves to believe it so to be, is a little difficult for us to persuade ourselves.

But perhaps it may be said, that 'tis indifferent whether we are sprinkled, or dipped. To which, I answer in the words of Dr. *Hughes*,¹ "Let us closely adhere to the scriptures: and whatever² institutions we meet with there, as appointed by God, let us religiously comply with. "In ³a word, nothing must be allowed in God's worship, "but what we have his warrant for." We ought therefore with him to conclude,⁴ "That the very silence of "scripture is enough to condemn *sprinkling*:" And that, consequently, it is no indifferent thing, whether this mode, which is not authorized by scripture, or immersion, which is therein appointed, be made use of in baptism. But if any one should say, asperision is a necessary alteration in our age and country; hear Mr. *Smith's* answer to it. "⁵ But, "says he, (*introducing the Papiſts* speaking) "the apostles "might know several things, which, tho' they were not "necessary---- in their days, would become necessary in "after-times; and therefore took care to hand them down "to the church by tradition, that she might exercise her "authority

¹ Dr. Hughes on S^ts & Images, p. 57. ² p. 35. ³ p. 37. ⁴ *ib.*

⁵ Mr. Smith on Authority and Infallibility, p. 30.

“ authority in proposing and declaring them to be necessary---at such times, and in such circumstances, as she, in her great prudence and infallible judgment, thought fit. But let us consider ; things necessary---at one time, and not at another ? necessary in our days, and not so in the days of the apostles ? necessary to Christians of later ages, and not so to the primitive Christians ? sure this cannot be true. I always thought that to be the Christian faith, which was once (and at once) delivered to the saints, by Christ and his apostles. But to let that pass : if this was the case, methinks, the apostles should have taken care to leave it upon record, or at least to have given us some hint in scripture, that more would be necessary ---- in after-times than was then : and yet I cannot find any thing like this [but a great deal to the contrary] in all the new testament.”

If any are so weak as to think that dipping may be dangerous to the adult, notwithstanding it is commanded of God, they are of a very different opinion from that eminent physician Dr. *Cheyne*, who in his *Essay of Health and Long Life*, recommends immersion as healthful, and laments the change of it into sprinkling in baptism ; where he says, page 100, 101. § 7. “ Under this head of exercise, I cannot forbear recommending cold-bathing. And I cannot sufficiently admire how it should ever have come into such disuse, especially among Christians, when commanded by the greatest law-giver that ever was, under the direction of God’s holy Spirit, to his chosen people, and perpetuated to us in the immersion at baptism, by the same Spirit ; who, with infinite wisdom in this, as in every thing else that regards the temporal and eternal felicity of his creatures, combines their duty with their eternal happiness.” But if any should still doubt the safety of immersion, let them read that other learned physician, Sir *John Floyer*, a zealous and pious member of the church of *England*, in his *Essay to restore the dipping of infants in their baptism*, where that subject is very largely treated. He asks, page 32, “ Is it not a presumption to alter a sacramental rite divinely instituted, and to propose a different rite because more convenient or more easily perform’d ? But the greatest blame they deserve, who know that sprinkling is a novel practice, without any divine authority, and yet do with trivial reasons obstinately defend it. Let the

“ Papists

“ Papists reform their compendium of the eucharist, and
 “ all Protestants theirs of baptism; for whatsoever our Sa-
 “ viour practised and commanded is necessary in both sa-
 “ craments.” In page 43. *he affirms*, “ It is not in our
 “ power to alter any of the positive commands called the
 “ sacraments; they are the laws of the Son of God,
 “ which must continue till his second coming, and are the
 “ chief parts of his institution.”

If any urge further, that tho’ the baptism of infants is not commanded in scripture, yet it is not forbidden; I return the excellent answer of Dr. *Hughes* thereunto.
 “ ¹ That the very silence of scripture is enough to con-
 “ demn it: *And that* whatever ² is appointed by others,
 “ if it have no foundation in the word of God, we are so
 “ far from being obliged to the practice of it, that in ho-
 “ nour to God we ought to protest against it, as a bold
 “ usurpation of the divine authority; and *should* ³ always
 “ bear our testimony against any additions made to it; or
 “ any thing in the worship of God appointed only by falli-
 “ ble men.” To the same purpose also is this passage of
 “ Dr. *Wright’s* ⁴: “A church built upon unscriptural tra-
 “ ditions; yea, upon anti-scriptural traditions; is a build-
 “ ing of men, raised by the help, and at the instigation of
 “ the God of this world; a kingdom set up to overthrow
 “ the great design of the gospel, and in direct opposition
 “ to our Saviour’s declaration, that his kingdom is not of
 “ this world. ⁵ For if it be our duty to stand fast in the
 “ things delivered by the apostles, and to hold to their
 “ epistles; then it is our duty to reject things that are
 “ evidently contrary to their epistles, and to doctrines and
 “ precepts set down in their writings.”

What therefore shall we say to a doctrine and practice of which the scripture is not only silent, but which it expressly contradicts, which is the present case; for the scripture is not only silent concerning infant-baptism, but expressly commands us to baptize the adult. Why, of such a doctrine and practice, we ought to say as Dr. *Earle* doth of purgatory: ⁶ “ Let us see what ground we have not only
 “ to reject the *Romish* doctrine . . . as having no founda-
 “ in scripture (which is enough to spoil the credit of any
 “ opinion that would set up for an article of faith) but to
 “ reject it with abhorrence as being contrary to scripture.”

These

¹ Dr. *Hughes* on Sts & Images, p. 37. ² Ib. p. 35. ³ Ib. p. 57.

⁴ Dr. *Wright* on Script. & Tradition, p. 35. ⁵ Ib. p. 38.

⁶ Dr. *Earle* on Purgatory, p. 48, 49.

These ministers therefore, if they are consistent with themselves, must disallow this plea for infant-baptism: 'tis unreasonable to ask us where it is forbidden; it lies upon them who practice it to shew where it is commanded. Whensoever God was pleased to give any positive institutions to mankind, he expected they should be punctually observed, and has shewn the highest displeasure against them who have presumed to make the least variations. When *Moses* was directed to make him a tabernacle, he strictly charged him to *make it according to the pattern shewed him in the mount*, *Exod. xxv. 9, 40. Heb. viii. 5.* The *Jews* were obliged to keep close to the divine command in those positive laws which were given them by *Moses*, and they who made any alteration were as much blamed, and as severely punished, as if what they did had been expressly forbidden. We have a dreadful instance in the case of *Nadab* and *Abihu*, whom God had chosen to be his priests. His law was, *The fire shall ever be burning upon the altar, it shall never go out, Lev. vi. 3.* in which they are commanded to keep the fire which came from heaven always burning, but are not expressly forbidden to offer strange fire. But nevertheless they were destroyed for offering strange fire, as severely as if it had been directly prohibited, *Lev. x. 1, 2.* And *Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, took either of them his censer; and put fire therein, and put incense thereon, and offered strange fire before the Lord, which he commanded them not: and there went out fire from the Lord, and devoured them, and they died before the Lord.* It was no excuse for them that strange fire was not forbidden; since they knew what was commanded, they ought to have adhered strictly to the divine appointment.

Again, God having directed the *Jews* to make his altars of earth, *Exod. xx. 24.* was greatly offended with them when they erected altars of brick. *Isaiah lxxv. 2, 3.* *I have spread out my hands all the day unto a rebellious people, which walketh in a way that is not good, after their own thoughts: a people that provoketh me to anger continually to my face, that sacrificeth in gardens, and burneth incense upon altars of brick.* And yet altars of brick are no where forbidden in express terms, any more than infant-baptism. Our Lord severely rebuked the Scribes and Pharisees for corrupting and making void the commandments of God by their own traditions; and shews us the danger of altering the laws of God, *Matth. v. 19.* *Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall*

shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven : but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.¹

And is there no danger in altering the institutions of Christ himself? are not all men as much obliged to keep close to his appointment, as the *Jews* were to be exact in observing the rituals of the law? 'Tis certain the *Jews* were commanded to hear him when he came, upon the severest penalty, *Deut. xviii. 15. The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken: according to all that thou desiredst of the Lord thy God in Horeb, in the day of the assembly, saying, Let me not hear again the voice of the Lord my God; neither let me see this great fire any more,*
that

¹ Let the reader consider the sixth letter of the learned Dr. *John Gale*, in his *Reflections on Mr. Wall, &c.* part of which follows, p. 242.

“ 2. In the next place, you may please to observe, that tho' in some cases the scripture's silence may leave the thing indifferent to the freedom or opinion of every man; yet 'tis far from being so always: things in their own nature indifferent may be left so well enough; but it is not an indifferent matter whether we obey God and Christ or not, and perform divine service according to his will and appointment: and therefore the scripture's silence cannot be pleaded here with any reason at all. They don't forbid us, in so many words expressly, to give the sacramental supper to a *Turk*, but who will therefore infer he may? Why does not our author baptize persons after they are dead, to wash them from all sins committed in their life-time, since the scripture does not expressly forbid him to baptize such, nor any where declare persons so baptized shall not be perfectly cleansed and forgiven?

“ Again, where does the scripture tell us in terms, the *Roman* is not the only true catholick church? that oral tradition may not entirely be depended on? that the doctrine of sacramental justification is a mischievous error? as the learned bishop of *Salisbury* nevertheless justly calls it; and argues, as I have hitherto done, in direct contradiction to our author's way, That 'since this is no where mentioned in all the large discourses that are in the new testament concerning justification, we have just reason to reject it.' Pilgrimages, and all kinds of penance, &c. stand upon the same bottom: but to give an instance something nearer to the matter in hand, we are no where forbid to baptize our cattle, bells, tables, &c. but yet our author, I hope, would never infer that they may, much less that they ought to be baptized: for to administer the sacraments to visibly unfit subjects, is no better than an impious profanation of them.”

that I die not. And the Lord said unto me, They have well spoken that which they have spoken. I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my words, which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him. But the prophet which shall presume to speak a word in my name which I have not commanded him to speak, or that shall speak in the name of other Gods, even that prophet shall die. St. Peter therefore in his preaching of the gospel strongly urges these prophecies, and assures us from hence, that severe punishments shall be inflicted upon all those who reject or disregard the precepts and commandments of Christ. For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren like unto me, him shall ye hear in all things, whatsoever he shall say unto you. And it shall come to pass, that every soul which will not hear that prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people. Acts iii. 22, 23. Nay, as our law-giver is more excellent than Moses, being the only-begotten Son of God, so it is reckoned a greater and more dangerous crime to reject his authority, than to disobey Moses, Heb. ii. 2, 3. For if the word spoken by angels was stedfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompence of reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him? 'Tis true, these texts speak of them who would not receive him; but it may, I think, be justly inferred from hence, that as it is a greater crime to reject him, than it was to reject Moses, so we are more highly obliged to adhere closely to his laws; and it must be proportionably a greater fault to alter his institutions, than to alter those of Moses. We are commanded by a voice from heaven to hear him, Matth. xvii. 15. but how can we hear him as we ought to do, if we do not strictly observe his institutions, but instead thereof practise what we imagine may do as well because it is not forbidden? If it be no good plea for the Papists withholding the cup from the people, that it is not forbidden; because our blessed Lord instituted his holy supper in both kinds: how can it be a just excuse for them or others to sprinkle infants, because this is not prohibited in so many words, when 'tis manifest, nevertheless, that we are only commanded to baptize them who believe? When Christ enjoins us to baptize

adult persons by immersion, he does in effect forbid us to baptize infants by any mode whatsoever. And if, notwithstanding this, men will presume to alter his institution, what will they be able to say, when this solemn question shall be asked them, Who hath required this at your hands? *Isaiah* i. 12. Since then we ought to follow the scripture rule in baptism, as well as in other things, it is to be wished that those gentlemen, who so freely and justly condemn the church of *Rome*, for making void the word of God by her traditions, would not themselves follow her tradition in baptizing infants. And that they do follow her, as to the mode, is expressly acknowledged, and fully proved, by *Dr. Wall*, in his History of infant-baptism,¹ where he says,

“ What has been said of the custom of pouring or sprinkling of water in the ordinary use of baptism, is to be understood only in reference to these Western parts of *Europe* ;

“ for it is used ordinarily no where else : the *Greek* church,

“ in all the branches of it, does still use immersion ; and

“ they hardly count a child, except in case of sickness, well

“ baptized without it. And so do all other Christians in the

“ world, except the *Latins*. That which I hinted before,

“ is a rule that does not fail in any particular, that I know

“ of, *viz.* All the nations of Christians that do now, or

“ formerly did, submit to the authority of the bishop of

“ *Rome*, do ordinarily baptize their infants by pouring,

“ or sprinkling. And tho’ the *English* received not this custom till after the decay of Popery, yet they have since

“ received it from such neighbour nations as had begun it

“ in the times of the pope’s power. But all other Christians in the world, who never owned the pope’s usurped

“ power, do, and ever did, dip their infants, in the ordinary use.”

That the *Roman* church should thus alter the institution of Christ, is not at all to be wondered at ; for, as *Dr. Wright* says², “ When they would thus set aside the written word of God itself, with the head of the corner, who can wonder at their setting aside other things, that are expressly delivered to us in these scriptures? They make one of the commandments of none effect, by their image-worship. They make the express words of Christ in the sacrament, *drink ye all of it*, of none effect, by refusing the cup. They make faith in God, or divine faith, of none effect, by setting up a human implicit

“ faith

¹ *The quarto Edition*, part ii. ch. ix. p. 477.

² *Dr. Wright on Scripture and Tradition*, p. 41.

“ faith in the stead of it: and they make the doctrine
 “ of repentance of none effect, by their confession
 “ and penances, and absolutions, instead of real amend-
 “ ment.” To all which instances he might have added,
 they make baptism of none effect, by giving it to those to
 whom it can be of no service, and by substituting rantism
 or sprinkling in its room and stead. But (as Mr. *Chandler*
 says ¹) “ As to those who have been bred up in the Pro-
 “ testant religion, and have the liberty of consulting the
 “ oracles of truth, for such to embrace the errors and
 “ *corruptions* of the anti-christian church of *Rome*, what
 “ excuse can be made for their madness? With what plea
 “ can they vindicate so shameful a *step*? . . . Can the
 “ traditions of men be a surer guide, than the oracles of
 “ the God of truth?” I think this is admirably well
 said, and very applicable to Protestants when they embrace
 the *Romish* error of infant-sprinkling, and reject the divine
 institution of adult baptism. And it is really to be admired,
 that Protestants can hope to prevail with Papists, to lay
 aside their unscriptural traditions, while they continue the
 practice of infant-baptism, for which no scripture can be
 alledged. They cannot but know that Mons. *Bossuet*, and
 other Popish writers, plead this practice of Protestant
 churches, in defence of the other traditions of the church
 of *Rome*; as the learned Dr. *Gale* has well observed, in
 his reflections on Dr. *Wall*’s History of Infant-Baptism,
 page 230, 231, 232. “ But all I will at present infer
 “ from it shall be only the inconsistency of our antagonists
 “ principles, in rejecting tradition, and appealing to the
 “ bible as the sole authority, when they dispute against the
 “ Papists; and in building, at the same time, the baptism
 “ of infants only on the pretended tradition of the church.
 “ That is, they will discard tradition, when it is against
 “ them, but if it will serve to support any particular do-
 “ ctrine or usage they are fond of, then it must be admit-
 “ ted.” [And a little after,] “ The want of adhering
 “ to the main ground of the reformation, has unhappily
 “ afforded the *Romish* party an opportunity to give it some
 “ terrible shocks.

“ They have often, and with great advantage, argued
 “ from infant-baptism; which, they strongly assert, is
 “ only grounded on the tradition of the church; and
 “ therefore will always remain an unanswerable argument

H 2

“ for

¹ Mr. Chandler’s Notes of the Church, p. 29.

“ for tradition, against all such as admit of that practice.
 “ To this the reformed divines have never yet made any
 “ solid answer ; and those passages which Mr. *Stennet*, in
 “ answer to *Ruffen*, has translated from the ingenious
 “ Monsieur *Bessuet*, will be a standing, unanswerable ob-
 “ jection to the Pædobaptist Protestants, and cannot be
 “ solv’d, but by flinging up infant-baptism, or else by
 “ shewing it to be founded on scripture, which, never-
 “ theless, ’tis confessed can’t be done. And the anony-
 “ mous answer to the Bishop of *Meaux* ingenuously ac-
 “ knowledges, that the passages produced do, at most,
 “ only prove that it is permitted, or rather, that it is not
 “ forbidden to baptize infants.

“ And who now would imagine, that Protestants should
 “ so generally, and that too after they have been often re-
 “ minded of it by the most learned prelates, and others of
 “ the *Romish* communion, their adversaries, still continue
 “ to practise what is so well demonstrated to be erroneous,
 “ I may say, unlawful ; especially, since it gives the *Roman-*
 “ *ists* such a handle to pursue this example on their side, in
 “ establishing what corruptions they please, and abrogating
 “ any of our Saviour’s laws ? For their inference is un-
 “ doubtedly very just, that if tradition, and the church’s
 “ authority, be a sufficient ground for altering one sacra-
 “ ment, it must likewise be sufficient to justify any changes
 “ made in the other, tho’ it be the denying the cup to the
 “ laity : and ’twill be a sufficient warrant also to introduce
 “ as many other sacraments as they think fit to invent :
 “ And thus confirmation, penance, extreme unction, or-
 “ dination, and matrimony, are proved to be as properly
 “ and truly sacraments, as the two which Christ instituted,
 “ viz. baptism, and the eucharist.”

And, as Dr. *Wright* well observes,† “ Upon this prin-
 “ ciple, every new council begins a new set of traditions ;
 “ and by thus contradicting and leaving the scripture, men
 “ of learning are led into endless mazes, and the most dis-
 “ honest arts ; and the poor laity in common life are sub-
 “ ject to perpetual tyranny, and to have new yokes of
 “ bondage put upon them in every age.”

Having thus shewn that we have the scriptures on our
 side, both for the subject and mode of baptism ; I shall pro-
 ceed briefly to shew, that we have the clear testimonies of
 the

† *Dr. Wright on Scripture and Tradition*, p. 50.

the most ancient Christians after the apostles times, on our side also. This argument, indeed, we might well spare, and would do it willingly enough, if all our opponents would but acknowledge, as some of the lecturers do, that if they had here the advantage over us, they could not lay any stress on it, for the proof of their point. To which purpose speaketh Dr. *Hughes*, in answer to what *Bellarmino* and *Azorius* say of the *Greek* and *Latin* fathers¹: “ That
 “ supposing what they assert be true, yet this will not
 “ prove the lawfulness or fitness of the practice. It proveth
 “ no more than that those fathers were of that opinion ;
 “ but this does not infer an obligation upon us to be of the
 “ same mind. Our religion is to be learnt from the sacred scriptures, and from no other authority. If the
 “ word of God appoints any religious worship, I am
 “ bound, upon my allegiance to my Lord and Master, to
 “ conform to it : if the word of God is silent, as to any
 “ act of religion, all the fathers, councils, and popes that
 “ ever were, have no authority to bind my conscience.
 “ 'Tis a bold invasion of the rights of Jesus Christ, the
 “ only law-giver to his church ; and in duty to him, I
 “ am bound to bear my testimony against such unwarrantable usurpation. He has left no deputy, or vicar,
 “ upon earth, neither has he qualified any for so important
 “ a trust.” If, therefore, we had neither fathers nor councils on our side, we should, according to Dr. *Hughes*, carry our point ; because we have the scriptures speaking for us : which thought is in few words well expressed by Mr. *Neal*² ; “ If the fathers were not silent [*on the side*
 “ *contrary to us, yet*] neither their authority, nor the dark
 “ and obscure tradition of later ages, ought to avail against
 “ scripture and reason.” Yea, in another place, if what he says be true, he has given antiquity a mortal wound, and shewn it to be entirely useless in proving any point :
 “ ³ Many legends and fabulous reports were raised
 “ but (says the learned *Joseph Scaliger*) from the end of
 “ the acts of the apostles, to the time of *Pliny* the younger
 “ (who lived under the Emperor *Trajan*) there is nothing
 “ certain in the history of the church.”

Were our *adversaries* always to talk thus, we could be content with our former advantage ; but this last censure of antiquity we think a little too morose and severe, since there are now extant the epistles of *Clemens*, *Barnabas*,
Hermas,

¹ Dr. *Hughes* on *Saints and Images*, p. 30.

² Mr. *Neal* on the *Supremacy*, p. 23.

³ Page 22.

Hermas, and *Ignatius*, containing some things very useful. Nor do Pædobaptists talk so slightly of antiquity in their controversies with us: and therefore I shall chuse to express the opinion of the Antipædobaptists concerning antiquity, and the reasons of our making use of this argument, in the words of Dr. *Harris*, with a few necessary variations; because his judgment of antiquity we look on as most reasonable and equitable, and it fully expresseth our sense. “¹ There is scarce any thing in which the Pædobaptists put in a stronger claim, or make a louder boast (in their disputes with Antipædobaptists) than the sense of antiquity, and the judgment of the ancient fathers; tho’ in the points (in debate) and in which they differ from us, scarce any thing is less fair, or more unjust. Now, tho’ we acknowledge nothing as an authoritative rule of faith, but the holy scriptures, the great charter of the Christian church, yet it must be allowed, that the first ages, and first writers, especially for the first three hundred years, had some opportunities and advantages of knowing the sense of scripture, beyond what we have at this distance of time, especially with relation to matters of fact, and the practice of the church; and we refuse not their arbitration in the present case.”

The first author I shall cite is *Justin Martyr*, who is not only silent about infant-baptism, as are all the fathers before him, but says what is inconsistent with it; for the reason he assigns, as what he had received from the apostles themselves, why baptism was instituted, is altogether incompatible and disagreeable thereunto. “² The reason of this institution of baptism (saith he) we have from the apostles. For having nothing to do in our first birth, but being begotten by necessity, or without our own consent, and trained up in vicious customs and company; to the end therefore we might continue no longer the children of necessity and ignorance, but of freedom and knowledge, and obtain remission of sins by virtue of this water, the penitent, who now makes his second birth the act of his own choice, has called over him the name of God the Father, &c.” From whence it appears according to *Justin*, that infant-baptism destroys the very end and design of baptism, and the reason handed down by the apostles for its institution: so that all the writers of the first century are wholly silent with regard to infant-

¹ Dr. Harris on Transubstantiation, p. 31.

² Just. Mart. Apol. translated by Reeves. § 80.

infant-baptism ; and *Justin* in the second is not only silent about it, but in effect contradicts it.

Tertullian, the first author who speaketh at all expressly of infant-baptism, speaketh against it. He saith,¹ “ That according to every one’s condition, disposition and age too, ’tis most useful to delay baptism, especially as to little children : indeed our Lord says, forbid them not to come unto me, therefore let them come when they grow up ; let them come, when they learn what they are taught, whither they come ; let them become Christians when they are able to know Christ, for why does that innocent age hasten to the remission of sins ? Men act more cautiously in temporal affairs : for this is to commit divine treasure to such as are not entrusted with an earthly estate. Let them first know how to desire salvation, that you may appear to have given to him that asks.

“ Moreover, according to Mr. *Whiston*,² there is a most remarkable passage in the famous letter of *Eusebius* to his diocess from the council of *Nice*, which almost determines the dispute about infant-baptism, but which hardly seems to have been hitherto made use of in that controversy : I shall take the liberty to set it down here, and to recommend it to the serious consideration of the Christian church. The words are these ; That paper which we drew up, and which was read in the presence of the emperor, most beloved of God, and which was owned to be right and was approved of, was in these words : As we have received from the bishops which were before us, and in our first catechising, and when we were baptized, and as we have learned from the holy scriptures ; and as we have believed when we were made presbyters, and when we were made bishops, and have taught the same ; so do we now believe, and so exhibit our faith. Which words seem most naturally to imply thus much, viz. that *Eusebius* by proposing this formulary to be subscribed by the council of *Nice*, took it for granted that the catechising of the bishops there present was the first branch of their Christianity ; that baptism directly succeeded the same ; and that themselves understood and professed their own proper faith when they were so baptized ; which, if true, ’tis certain, infant-baptism in the modern sense, with its sureties, was not in the *Greek* church till after the council of *Nice*.”

The

¹ *Tert. de Baptismo*, in *Stenner’s* answer to *Russen*, p. 69.

² *Whiston’s* Post. to his arg. in behalf of the Dissent. Minистра.

The sixth canon of the council of *Neocaesarea* also, which was made to satisfy this doubt, Whether it was lawful to baptize a woman with child? (which scruple arose from a fear lest the child being laid under water together with the mother, should be thought to be baptized with her) thus determines; "That she ought to be illuminated, *i. e.* baptized, when she desires it; for in this there is no communion between the woman with child, and the child she goes with; because the proper choice of each person should be discovered, and that by a profession." *Stennet* against *Ruffen*, p. 103.

So that let *Pædobaptists* say what they please, the most antient fathers and councils are against infant-baptism. ¹ "The writers of the first age are... silent upon this head;" the writers of the next age condemn it; and until *Cyprian*, *i. e.* till the middle of the third century after Christ, full a hundred years after *Justin Martyr*, and fifty after *Tertullian*, (who are on our side) none of the antients approve of it. So that I may well say of believers baptism in opposition to infant-baptism, pretty much what *Mr. Bayes* saith in another case: " ² If it was the practice of our blessed Saviour and his apostles, and of Christians for above two hundred years after their days, I see not what right the church of *Rome* (or any other church whatsoever) had to alter it, or with what face they can give infants this privilege, when they have neither scripture nor antiquity to support them in it." And this further I must beg leave to add, in the words of *Mr. Neal*; that " ³ If we lay these things together, and consider the silence of the sacred records and genuine remains of antiquity, ... it will amount to a demonstration that [*infant-baptism as well as*] the hierarchy of the church of *Rome* is built upon the sand." And therefore I may very fitly apply what *Dr. Grosvenor* says of Popery in general; " ⁴ Scripture knows it not, antiquity is ignorant of it; it's foolish in *Pædobaptists* to think of doing much for it by argument: writing is only an amusement." For I am entirely of his mind, where he says, " ⁵ That Popery as such is not Christianity. No, antichrist is not Christ; idolatry and superstition is not gospel-worship; the mass is not the Lord's supper." Let me also add, that infant-sprinkling is not Christian baptism. And indeed one of the

¹ *Mr. Neal on the Supremacy*, p. 22.

³ *ib.* p. 30.

² *Mr. Bayes on Worship in the vulgar Tongue*, p. 44.

⁴ *Dr. Grosvenor on Persecution*, p. 35, 36.

⁵ *ib.* p. 32.

the Lecture. Dr. Earle, seemeth to be of our mind, with regard to the antiquity of adult baptism ; otherwise I know not what to make of one passage in his sermon, the words whereof are these : “¹ The persons thus said to be cleansed
 “ or forgiven their sins, are, no doubt, believers, all that
 “ are truly so, who with the heart believe, according to
 “ that of St. *Paul*, *Romans* x. 10. With the heart, man
 “ believeth unto righteousness. Remission of sins is thro’
 “ faith in Christ’s blood, *Rom.* iii. 25. And the righte-
 “ ousness of God is by faith in Jesus Christ unto all : and
 “ whosoever believeth in him, shall receive the remission
 “ of sins, *Acts* x. 43. So *ch.* xiii. 38, 39. Be it known
 “ to you therefore, men and brethren, that through this
 “ man is preached unto you forgiveness of sins, and by
 “ him all that believe are justified from all things, &c. *i. e.*
 “ All true believers, whose character is, that they walk
 “ in the light, and not in darkness, and prove their faith
 “ by their works ; for we deny a dead faith to be justify-
 “ ing, whatever our enemies may pretend. This doctrine of
 “ the forgiveness of sins for the sake of Christ, upon faith
 “ professed in baptism, was always an article of the Chri-
 “ stian creed.” And again, “² The persons thus cleansed,
 “ I say, are true believers, such as believe with the heart,
 “ and make a free profession of their faith, and live an-
 “ swerably to it.”

If these words have any meaning in them, they seem very plainly to shew that in the doctor’s opinion, baptism was given by the primitive Christians to them only, who made a profession of faith, and that it was always one article of the Christian creed that remission of sins was annexed to this baptism. From whence it follows, that there was once a time, when the Christian church did not believe that baptism might be perform’d without a profession of faith ; and consequently thought that infants might not be baptized. Whether this or something like it must not be the doctor’s meaning, I leave to the reader’s consideration.

There is another passage in the doctor’s discourse from whence one may gather, that there was formerly a great body of people, who were wont to defer baptism for a long time. “³ The *Novatians* (saith the doctor) declared that
 “ there was no mercy for them, who should fall after
 “ baptism ; at least that the church could not forgive them,
 “ and receive them into communion again, but must for
 “ ever exclude them her society, and leave them to the

I

“ judgment

¹ Dr. Earle on Purgatory, p. 6. ² Ibid. p. 7. ³ Ibid. p. 7, 8.

“ judgment of God.” None of which is, ~~it~~ conceive, agreeable to infant-baptism. For,

1. The distinction of sins into those before baptism, which were capable of mercy from God ; and sins after baptism, to which God would not extend mercy, or which at least the church could not forgive ; supposeth that these people ordinarily lived for some time without baptism, after they came to the use of reason ; so long, as, that they might perpetrate several, even gross, sins before it. Moreover,

2. A people who had such dreadful notions of the danger of sinning after baptism, where not likely to make haste to baptize any in their childhood, but rather to defer baptism too long. This people separated themselves from the church in the time of *Cyprian* and *Cornelius*, when infant-baptism first began to come in ; which is a grand confirmation of what we have before said, that till the time of *Cyprian*, infant-baptism was never approved of : for had it universally prevailed before the *Novatian* separation, those people would, in all likelihood, have had it amongst them, which we don't find they had ; on the contrary, I have several reasons to believe they had it not, but these here mention'd are sufficient.

I shall now proceed from the subject to the mode ; and that we here likewise have antiquity on our side, for immersion, is the judgment of the great archbishop *Tillotson* in his sermon upon *Colos.* iii. 1, 2. whose words I will transcribe, because I apprehend they will have some weight with my readers : Having quoted *Col.* ii. 12. and *Rom.* vi. 3, 4, 5. he says, “ Where we see, that to be baptized into the
“ death and resurrection of Christ, is to be baptized into
“ the similitude and likeness of them ; and the resemblance
“ is this, that as Christ being dead was buried in the grave,
“ and after some stay in it, that is, for three days, he was
“ raised again out of it by the glorious power of God to a
“ new and heavenly life, being not long after taken up
“ into heaven to live at the right hand of God ; so Chri-
“ stians when they were baptized were immers'd into the
“ water three times, their bodies being covered all over
“ with it, which is therefore called our being buried with
“ him in baptism into death ; and after some short stay
“ under water were raised or taken up again out of it, as
“ if they had been recovered to a new life ; by all which
“ was spiritually signified our dying to sin, and being raised
“ to a divine and heavenly life, through the faith of the
“ operation

“ operation of God ; that is, by that divine and superna-
 “ tural power which raised up Christ from the dead. So
 “ that Christians from thenceforth were to reckon them-
 “ selves dead unto sin, but alive unto God, through Jesus
 “ Christ, as the apostle speaks, *Rom. vi. 11.* And,

The judicious author of the Plain Account of the Na-
 ture and End of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper,
 says, page 150. ‘ It is therefore, I think, truly affirm'd,
 ‘ that, “ The participation ¹ of the benefits purchased by
 “ Christ's death, is, by a very proper figure of speech, in
 “ this sacrament, stiled the receiving of Christ's body and
 “ blood ; as it is in the other [*viz.* baptism] stiled a being
 “ buried with Christ and rising with him again.” For,
 ‘ 1. This latter expression, made use of by St. *Paul*,
 ‘ with relation to baptism, is taken from the custom of
 ‘ immersion in the first days ; and from that particular
 ‘ manner of baptizing proselytes : by which they were first
 ‘ covered with water, and in a state as it were of death
 ‘ and inactivity ; and then arose out of it into a sort of
 ‘ new state of life and action. And if baptism had been
 ‘ then perform'd, as it is now amongst us, we should never
 ‘ have so much as heard of this form of expression of dying
 ‘ and arising again in this rite.’ See also the bishop of
Sarum, as quoted page 8.

Agreeable to all which Lord Chancellor *King* in his
 enquiry, &c.² thus gives us the judgment and practice of
 the best antiquity. ‘ That their usual custom was to im-
 ‘ merse or dip the whole body. When St. *Barnabas* de-
 ‘ scribes a baptized person, 'tis by his going down into
 ‘ the water. “ We go down, saith he, into the water
 “ full of sin and filth, but we ascend with fruit and bene-
 “ fit in our hearts.” ‘ And so *Tertullian* represents bap-
 ‘ tized persons, “ as entred into the water, and as let
 “ down into the water.” ‘ And *Justin Martyr* describes
 ‘ the same, “ by being washed in water ;” ‘ and calls
 ‘ the place where they are baptized, *λεβηθ* a washing-
 “ place, or a bath :” ‘ whence *Firmilian* inveighing a-
 ‘ gainst the baptism of hereticks, condemns it as carnal,
 ‘ and as being upon that account, “ No whit different
 “ from the baptism or washing of the *Jews*, which they
 “ used as a common and ordinary bath to wash away the
 “ filth of their bodies.” And elsewhere, ³ ‘ immersion
 ‘ was (always) used in their ordinary publick baptism ;
 “ when, as *Tertullian* writes, they dipped the baptized
 “ person

I 2

¹ Dr. *Clarke's Exp. Ch. Cat.* p. 311.

² Part II. p. 73.

³ Ibid. p. 78.

“ person three times under water ;” “ that is, dipping him once at the naming of each person of the holy trinity. “ We are, says the aforesaid father, dipped at the naming of each person.” Thus his Lordship, who altho’ he pleadeth likewise for sprinkling, yet could he find no more than two passages ¹ to produce for it in all antiquity, and these too not to the purpose : for they prove this only, that in cases of necessity Christians in *Cyprian’s* time admitted and allowed, but never that they commended and preferred pouring. But what is this to the purpose ? It proveth indeed that Christians in some cases admitted of perfusion, but never that they in the least allowed of aspersion only, which is a step even beyond this.

Moreover one of the passages sheweth, that this practice, even under those necessitous circumstances, was not so universally approved of, but that *Magnus* a bishop doubted of its validity : to satisfy whom, *Cyprian* was forced to write a large letter, cited by his lordship ; which, whether it satisfied *Magnus* or no, I cannot tell, but this I know, that if it did, he was more easily satisfied than I should have been. But this same father, ² *St. Cyprian*, the darling author of our warmest adversaries, and the ancientest patron of infant-baptism, has a very remarkable passage, . . . which is worth transcribing ; [*it being a flat contradiction of his letter to Magnus.*] Some in his time made so free with the other Sacrament, as to presume to use water only instead of wine ; for which too it seems they pleaded antiquity. And the father answers them thus : If in that sacrifice which Christ offer’d, none but Christ is to be follow’d, then certainly we ought to obey Christ, and do what he commanded us to do ; since he says in the gospel, If ye do what I command you, henceforth I call you not servants, but friends. And that Christ only is to be obey’d, even the father witnesses from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son in whom I am well-pleased ; hear ye him. Wherefore, if Christ only is to be our guide, we are not to regard what some others before us have rashly presum’d to do, but only what Christ, who is before all, first practis’d. We are not to follow the customs of men, but the truth of God ; for God speaking by the prophet *Isaiab*, says, In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. And a little after he concludes, ’tis very dangerous

¹ Part II. p. 74, 77.

² Dr. Gale’s *Reflections on Wall*, &c. p. 223.

gerous to change any thing by human traditions, from what it was at first by divine institution.'

The other passage quoted by his lordship shews, that people in general were so dissatisfied with this clinical perfusion, that they could scarcely be induc'd to admit any to the ministry, who had been baptized that way; of which they would have made no difficulty, had it been unquestionably of divine original: which is confirm'd by Sir *John Floyer* in his Essay to restore dipping, pag. 44. "*Bede* says "*St. Austin* baptized 10,000 in the river *Swale* on *Christmas day* the coldest time in our climate; this was about 600 years after our Saviour: and the antient church esteem those who were baptized by affusion of water, tho' upon occasion of sickness to be irregularly baptized, and they would never admit them into holy orders. And,

Dr. Gale in his answer to *Wall*, says, p. 213. "*Mr. Wall* can't find an antient writer who will pretend with him, that baptism may be administred indifferently in any manner, much less any who argues from the signification of the *Greek* word, or any passage in the *Christian canon*, that affusion or the like is good and regular baptism. On the contrary it appears they always insisted very much upon immersion, and in a very antient council held here in *England*, under *Kenwulfe* king of the *Mercians*, An. 816. 'Tis expressly ordered that baptism shall not be administred by sprinkling, but by dipping." And according to Sir *John Floyer*, pag. 6. and 45. king *Edward VI.* and queen *Elizabeth* were both baptized by dipping; and speaking of king *Edward's* liturgies, "In the first book of *Edward VI.* 'tis said, they shall dip it in water thrice: first dipping the right side, secondly, the left side, the third time, dipping the face towards the font.

Let any man now judge which mode of baptizing is to be preferred, dipping or sprinkling; for dipping there are many clear testimonies, which shew it to have been the practice of the *Christian church* for many ages: on the other side, there are only two weak and inconsiderable passages, allowing perfusion, and that only in cases of necessity.

This plainly shews that the present mode of sprinkling, is not of divine institution; for, as *Mr. Neal* saith in another case, "Had our Lord, or his apostles, appointed it, we might expect to meet not only with the name in scripture, but with the express institution in the most plain
" and

* *Mr. Neal* on the Supremacy, p. 9.

“ and significant words; or at least that it should be read
 “ in every page of antiquity: but if the most antient fa-
 “ thers of the church (*before Cyprian*) consent in any thing,
 “ it is in a general silence about this matter. ¹ The writers
 “ of the first age (*as he says elsewhere in another case*) are
 “ also silent upon this head:” and so are those of the second,
 and half the third too. What consent of fathers, for two
 centuries and a half, can they bring either for aspersions or
 perfusion? none at all. I may therefore say in the words of
 Dr. *Grosvenor*; “ ² Scripture knows them not; antiquity
 “ is ignorant of them.” And in the words of Mr. *Neal*,³
 “ I may venture to challenge all that is between this and
 “ Rome to prove such consent; the fathers never dream’d
 “ of it . . . and are entirely silent about it. “ ⁴ However
 “ (as Dr. *Hughes* says) if antiquity be of any consequence
 “ in determining matters of religion, the earliest must be
 “ the best, and this is clearly against the *Pædobaptists* in
 “ the affair now before us.”

And now I shall once more beg the use of Mr. *Bayes*’s
 words, which I will repeat again with a very little varia-
 tion, because I very much approve them. “ ⁵ If immersion in
 “ baptism was the practice of our blessed Saviour and his
 “ apostles, and of Christians for *above two hundred and fifty*
 “ years after their days, [*yea, and the general practice much*
 “ *longer,*] I see not what right the church of Rome (or any
 “ other church whatsoever) had to alter it, or with what face
 “ they can deny men this privilege, when they have nei-
 “ ther scripture nor antiquity to support them in it.” To
 “ which let me also add the words of Dr. *Hughes*; ⁶ I can-
 “ not help remarking here that one grand cause of errors
 “ both in faith and practice is a pretending to be wise above
 “ what is written, and concluding what is fit to be settled
 “ in matters of God, from what is usually done amongst
 “ men. ’Tis a foolish conceit, that God is such an one as
 “ ourselves, which disposes men to make alterations in the
 “ constitution and settlement of his kingdom, and boldly to
 “ invade his royal prerogative: God will surely sooner or
 “ later reprove those who dare treat him in so free a manner.”

Thus have I endeavoured to show, by a vast number of
 passages extracted from the sermons preached at *Salter’s-
 Hall* against Popery, that those gentlemen’s reasoning af-
 fects not only the Papists, but themselves also, in their re-
 jecting

¹ Mr. *Neal* on the Supremacy, p. 22.

² Dr. *Grosvenor* on Persecution, p. 35, 36.

³ Mr. *Neal* on the Supremacy, p. 23. ⁴ Dr. *Hughes*, p. 30.

⁵ Mr. *Bayes* on Worship, &c. p. 44. ⁶ Dr. *Hughes*, p. 34.

jecting the baptism of adult persons, and substituting in the room thereof, the sprinkling of infants. But before I conclude I think it not improper to transcribe a passage or two more, which will not only justify the Protestant Pædobaptist churches in their separation from the *Romish* church, but will also vindicate the baptized churches separation from the Pædobaptist churches of every denomination. For as Mr. *Lowman* says,¹ “ The worship of God is a first
 “ and principal duty of the law of nature and of all religion : to worship God according to the directions of the
 “ Christian revelation, is a chief duty of Christianity. Is
 “ it possible then a doctrine so uncertain and doubtful, so
 “ erroneous and false, as ² *infant-sprinkling*, should null
 “ and make void *one of* the chief and most sacred *ordinances*
 “ of the Christian revelation ? ³ These errors and corruptions are incorporated into the most solemn acts of worship, and the members of *Pædobaptist* churches are obliged to approve them as well as to use them. . . But had
 “ their errors and corruptions been of much less evil and
 “ dangerous consequence than they really are ; yet persons
 “ who knew them to be errors, who were fully convinced
 “ in conscience they were corruptions, could not profess to
 “ believe them, could not practise them without plain hypocrisy and evident falsehood, which are inconsistent with the faith and obedience of the gospel of Christ, and are in themselves damnable sins. For, as one well observes,
 “ God, the eternal truth, neither can nor will oblige us to
 “ believe any the least or most innocent falsehood to be a
 “ divine truth, that is, to err ; nor to profess a known
 “ error, which is, to lye. So that if you require the belief
 “ of any error among the conditions of your communion,
 “ our obligation to communicate with you ceaseth, and so
 “ the imputation of schism to us vanisheth into nothing ;
 “ but lies heavy upon you, for making our separation from
 “ you just and necessary, by requiring unnecessary and unlawful conditions of your communion. Not therefore to
 “ forsake the errors of the *Pædobaptist* churches, believing
 “ them to be errors, or not to forsake the practice and profession of them, says the same great author, had been
 “ damnable hypocrisy, supposing that those errors in
 “ themselves were not damnable.
 “ This plain reason made it necessary for all persons who
 “ were sensible of the errors and corruptions of the *Pædobaptists* to separate from the external communion of
 “ *their*

¹ Mr. *Lowman* on Schism, p. 26.

³ P. 20, 23, &c.

² His words are, the Pope's Supremacy, &c.

“ *their churches*; because they could not possibly continue
 “ in them without falshood and dishonesty, lying and hy-
 “ pocrify, which to be sure are damnable sins in themselves.

“ ¹ It is a plain and sure truth, (says archbishop *Laud*)
 “ the schism is theirs whose the cause of it is: and he
 “ makes the separation, that gave the first just cause of it;
 “ not he that makes an actual separation, upon a just cause
 “ first given. . . . The question then, whether the prin-
 “ ciples of *Pædobaptists* are schismatical, may be brought
 “ to this plain issue: whether those *churches* imposing the
 “ profession and practice of great errors and corruptions on
 “ persons who could not profess and practise them, with-
 “ out danger of cutting themselves off from the commu-
 “ nion of the true church with Christ the head, and with-
 “ out damnable sin, . . . is not the real cause of a very grie-
 “ vious schism in the church of Christ?

² “ The greatest danger of all in schism, is to be cut off
 “ from the unity of the catholick church, by not holding
 “ the head, in departing from the faith and obedience of
 “ the gospel. It is very far from certain, that to sepa-
 “ rate from the external communion of the *Pædobaptist*
 “ *churches*, is to separate from Christ---; it is more cer-
 “ tain, that *no church of Christ* upon earth can have those
 “ powers . . . But this is still more certain, that to com-
 “ municate with *such a church*, in her corruptions, know-
 “ ing them to be so, is to separate ourselves from Christ
 “ himself, the real head of the church, by departing from
 “ the faith and obedience of his gospel.”

And therefore it was very justly said by Mr. *Chandler*,
 “ ³ That as far as men depart from the doctrine of Christ
 “ and his apostles, so far they cease to be members of the
 “ church of Christ, and are to be marked and avoided by
 “ all the faithful. For, as Dr. *Hughes* words it, ⁴ ‘Tis a
 “ bold invasion of the rights of Jesus Christ, the only
 “ law-giver to his church; and in duty to him I am bound
 “ to bear my testimony against such unwarrantable
 “ usurpations. He has left no deputy or vicar on earth,
 “ neither has he qualified any for so important a trust.”

To the same purpose also speaks Mr. *Leavesly*, where he
 says, ⁵ “ We don’t erect a Protestant supremacy and in-
 “ fallibility upon the ruins of the papal, nor undertake to
 “ maintain all the doctrines of *Luther* and *Zuinglius*, or
 “ *Calvin*,

¹ Mr. *Lowman* on Schism, p. 17, 18. ² Ibid. p. 30.

³ Mr. *Chandler*, p. 15.

⁴ Dr. *Hughes*, p. 30.

⁵ Mr. *Leavesly*, p. 12.

“ *Calvin, or the churches of France, or England, or Scotland.* This would be to build up again what we have destroyed, and to ruin that liberty of examining and proving all things, that we may hold fast that which is good. “ For ¹ Christ and his apostles by preaching and delivering the gospel-truth, and by warning us of false apostles and deceitful workers, call all men every where to adhere to the truth as it is in Jesus. The ministry that they instituted we are bound to set up: the assemblies of Christians which they commanded, we are bound to frequent: the sacraments they instituted we are bound to observe: “ [*He should have said Jesus Christ*] and we are sure that “ where two or three are met together in the name of Christ, “ he will be with them; they have his authority, and shall “ have his blessing. Now, should we neglect his call, or “ corrupt his institutions, we tremble at the anathema that “ would then indeed belong to us.

“ And [*a little lower*] we cannot but think our separation “ from the *Pædobaptist* communion necessary, to hold out “ a light of warning and direction to them. ’Tis conscience “ therefore of our duty to God and man, and that fidelity “ that we owe to Jesus Christ our only Lord, that binds “ this necessity upon us.” He has made it our duty, where he says, *Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven, [and before the angels of God, as Luke.] But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven, [and before the angels of God, as Luke.] For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul? Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words (in this adulterous and sinful generation) of him also shall the son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his father with the holy angels, Mat. x. 32, 33. Luke xii. 8, 9. Mark viii. 36, &c.*

There are many more remarkable passages in the sermons very much to my purpose, which the reader may find in the pages referred to in the margin; ² but those I have

K

already

¹ Mr. *Leavesly*, p. 36, 37.

² Mr. *Barker* Popery the great Corrupt. p. 13, 14, 16.

Mr. *Chandler* the Notes of the Church, p. 3, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 21, 25.

Mr.

already cited are sufficient. And certainly if the arguments contained in them are of any weight against the corrupt doctrines and traditions of the church of *Rome*, and sufficient to bear down her authority in matters of religion, they are equally forcible to weigh down the authority, and to invalidate the corrupt traditions of any other church. And if these gentlemen practise or believe any thing as a part of the religion of the holy Jesus, which cannot be plainly and clearly proved from the new testament, they must be looked upon as self-condemned; their own arguments being a full confutation of them; as they will continue to be, until they reform in every thing wherein they deviate from scripture, and strictly conform themselves to the example and doctrine of Christ and his apostles, according to the direction of the unerring word of God.

But if they, with the church of *Rome*, think they may be allowed to alter the institution of God, and to substitute infant-sprinkling instead of adult-baptism by immersion, upon the profession of repentance and faith; of what profit and to what purpose then are their lectures against Popery? Can the priests or members of that church desire more in their own justification, and will they not be thereby able to baffle them upon other subjects? Is it not the very same thing with what Mr. *Bayes* quotes from *Hoffmest*, p. 33. "The church does not at all offend in departing from this
" institution

Mr. *Neal* on the Supremacy of *Peter*, p. 11, 26, 30, 31.

Mr. *Smith* on Author. and Infall. p. 11, 12, 13, 15, 18, 19, 20, 24, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32.

Dr. *Wright* on Scripture and Tradition, throughout. ^A

Dr. *Harris* on Transubstantiation, p. 19, 31, 35.

Dr. *Hughes* on Ven. Saints and Images, p. 14, 30, 31, 32, 35.

Dr. *Hunt* on Penance and Pilgrimages, p. 10.

Mr. *Bayes* on Worship in unknown Tongue, p. 34, 43.

Mr. *Newman* on the Doctrine of Merit, &c. p. 4, 5.

Dr. *Earle* on Purgatory, p. 8, 43, 49.

Mr. *Lowman* on Schism, p. 6, 10, 13, 14, 18, 19, 27, 28, 29, 36, 38, 39, 41, 45, 46, 47, 48.

Dr. *Grosvenor* on Persecution, &c. p. 15, 16.

Mr. *Leavelly* on Reformation, p. 8, 9, 13, 14, 15, 38, 39, 40.

If any of the expressions I have quoted, or here refer to, should be thought too severe, I desire they may be understood in proportion to the different importance of the subjects: and certainly it must be allow'd to be a great crime, to corrupt or alter any one institution of Christ, tho' it is a more grievous crime to corrupt almost the whole Christian religion, as the Papists have done.

“ institution of *St. Paul*, it being left free to the church,
 “ not only to violate this institution of *St. Paul*, but also
 “ the institutions of God himself, supposing them to have
 “ been once profitable to the church, but now unprofitable.”

Therefore let Protestants of all denominations consider the absolute necessity there is of a thorough reformation among themselves; and that they are not left to their own liberty, to act as they please, in what doctrines and what ordinances to believe and observe, according to the letter of the word; and in what others they please to deviate from that rule. For one great characteristick of our being true disciples of, and friends to Christ, is, our continuing in his word, and doing whatsoever he commands. *John viii. 31. Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on him, If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed. And John xv. 9, 10, 14. As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you; continue ye in my love. If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love, even as I have kept my father's commandments, and abide in his love. Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you.*

I hope none will imagine, from what I have written, that we lay too much stress upon baptism. Far be it from us to think, that the form without the power of religion will be of the least service to us, or tend to any thing but our greater condemnation, without sincere and undissembled piety, and the steady practice of every moral virtue, which is the substance of religion, and the great end of the Christian revelation. We look upon baptism to be a fulfilling of righteousness, as it is commanded, and as such an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace in the soul; *not the putting away the filth of the flesh only, but the answer of a good conscience towards God; a publick declaration that we put on Christ, and that as we are thereby planted in the likeness of his death, and also in the likeness of his resurrection, even so we also should walk in newness of life, Rom. vi. 4, 5.* For we judge of the form and power of religion, according to what our Saviour says of the Scribes and Pharisees, *Matth. xxiii. 23. Ye pay tythe of mint, and anise, and cummin; and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith, (or the love of God, as Luke has it, chap. xi. 42.) These ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone.* So also whatever ceremonies the Son of God has instituted, every one who believes in him is under a moral obligation

to observe, in the same manner they were at first appointed, because it is a part of natural religion to do whatever God commands.

Natural and reveal'd religion are not to be consider'd as two distinct things. By the Christian dispensation they are inseparably united. The principles and duties arising from the first are in the latter clearly and plainly recommended and enforced by proper sanctions, well suited to the natural desire of happiness and aversion to misery implanted in every man. Every moral virtue which can possibly be supposed to arise from natural religion, is by revelation greatly improved beyond whatever had been or was likely to be attained by the meer unassisted light of human reason.

The positive precepts of revelation are but few, every way worthy of God to prescribe, and reasonable for men to observe and do, as they have a fitness to promote true piety and strict virtue, and thereby keep men from lapsing into sin and error. So that by a due attention to the scriptures of the New Testament, Christians will be secure from the two extreams of superstition and infidelity. Would all Protestants strictly conform their doctrines and and practice to the scripture rule, primitive Christianity might then be expected to flourish and prevail; but on the contrary, nothing is more common now than the great and just complaint of the growth and increase of Popery and infidelity; and I can't but think, that the Pædobaptist Protestants have given too much encouragement to both by departing from the scripture rule. What advantage they have given Papists by complying with their tradition in sprinkling infants has been remark'd already; and may it not be justly feared, that Deists observing men who profess a sacred regard to the scriptures, and yet nevertheless contradicting them in so plain a case as the positive institution of baptism, may thereby be tempted to think such men only pretend to believe the scriptures, but in their hearts do not believe them? Or if they do in reality believe them to be of divine authority, and yet deviate from one of the plainest precepts thereof, 'tis not to be supposed that those who are in doubt of that authority can ever be prevail'd upon by such persons to receive and acknowledge them as a guide to eternal happiness, but on the contrary may by this means be confirm'd in their infidelity. Protestants therefore should well consider, that by their practice of infant-sprinkling they weaken the force of all their arguments against Deism.

To

To conclude ; It may perhaps be thought strange by some, that a Protestant dissenter should at this time appear in print, and publish remarks upon the sermons preached by Protestant dissenting ministers against Popery : To such I can truly say, it was my great regard for truth and the love I have to primitive Christianity, which first induced me to set about this work ; and I have very often wished, a more able hand had undertaken it, being persuaded that this is a fair opportunity to endeavour the restoring of the despised ordinance of believers baptism ; and being unwilling that it should be wholly lost, I therefore appear in this manner ! ' For as Dr. *Bale* confesses, " That if men must " take their religion out of the scriptures, (and particularly " he quotes *Heb. vi. 1, 2.*) That then, both Papists and " Protestants must all cross the cudgels to the Anabaptists ; " meaning they must strive no further against us." And every reader may discern, that 'tis not my design in the least to defend Popery ; the corrupt doctrines and superstitions of which can never be too much exploded. And, I think, they would have been more successfully exposed and confuted (such of them as have been treated of in the course of those lectures) if they had been attack'd by men, who, by the exact conformity of their practice to the sacred scriptures of the New-Testament in all religious duties and services, were able to defend and maintain their own arguments against the craft of Popish priests, or their discerning converts.

But alas! how is this possible, so long as they, though in opposition to Popery they are obliged to assert the sacred scriptures to be the only rule to Christians, do nevertheless deviate from them, by altering one of the plainest ordinances thereof, in flat contradiction to their own doctrine. They say, with respect to the fathers, "...² it proves " no more than that those fathers were of that opinion, but " this does not infer an obligation upon us to be of the same " mind. Our religion is to be learned from the sacred scriptures, and from no other authority. If the word of God " appoints any religious worship, I am bound upon my " allegiance to my Lord and Master to conform to it; if " the word of God is silent as to any act of religion, all " the fathers, councils and popes that ever were, have no " authority to bind my conscience : 'tis a bold invasion of " the

¹ In his *End to controversy*, as quoted by Mr. *Grantham* in his *Christianismus Primitivus*, B. 3. Ch. 5. p. 35.

² Dr. *Hughes's* Sermon, p. 30. also Mr. *Barker's*, p. 7, 8.

“ the rights of Jesus Christ, the only law-giver to his church ; and in duty to him, I am bound to bear my testimony against such unwarrantable usurpation.” From these maxims they derived all their solid arguments against this corrupt doctrine of the Papists, “ That since many things which ought to be believed and done, are not at all contained in scripture, the church hath authority to decree and enjoin these things, as necessary to salvation ; and all Christians are thereupon obliged to believe and practise accordingly.” This I take to have been the main source of all those innovations which have prevailed among them. Let all Protestants therefore not only disclaim this authority in words, but let them in fact lay aside all practices which are not warranted by scripture, and have nothing but tradition to plead ; as one in this case honestly confessed, who being ask’d a question about the immersion of adult persons, answered, “ I dare say nothing against the practice, but we have a tradition to sprinkle, and that’s as well.” While they retain such practices, in spite of their Protestant principles, ’tis impossible for them to argue against Papists, without exposing themselves to censure. For as St. Paul observes, they are justly blameable, whose practice is not strictly conformed to their own doctrines, and to the arguments which they make use of against others. *Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest, for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself ; for thou that judgest dost the same things. And thinkest thou this, O man, that judgest them that do such things, and dost the same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God ? For there is no respect of persons with God, Rom. ii. 1, 2, 3, 11.* But not to transcribe all that may be applied in this chapter, I shall only recite a few verses more (v. 17, to 21.) and I hope for the better adapting them to the case in hand, I may be allowed to put the word *Protestant* for *Jew*, and *scriptures* for *law*. *Behold, thou art called a Protestant, and restest in the scriptures, and makest thy boast of God, and knowest his will, and approvest the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of the scriptures ; and art confident that thou thyself art a guide of the blind, a light to them that are in darkness, an instructor of the foolish, a teacher of babes, which hast a form of knowledge, and of the truth in the scriptures : Thou therefore which teachest another, teachest thou not thyself ? . . . thou*

¹ Mr. Smith on Authority and Infallibility, p. 23.

² Mr. S----, Minister of an Independent Congregation at N-----.

... *thou that makest thy boast of the scriptures, through breaking the scriptures dishonourest thou God?* These places I acknowledge speak of men who committed the same immoralities which they condemned in others; but I humbly conceive they may afford a proper admonition to all Christians not to make any alterations in the institutions of Christ, which they justly censure in others. To this also well agree the words of our Saviour; *But Jesus answered, and said unto them, Why do you also transgress the commandment of God by your tradition? Howbeit, in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. For laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men, as the washing of pots and cups: and many other such like things ye do. And he said unto them, Full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition... making the word of God of none effect, thro' your tradition, which ye have delivered,* Mat. xv. 3, 6, 9. Mark vii. 7, 8, 9, 13.

I was moved to publish this Tract by a sincere and hearty desire that the reformation might be carried on still farther; and that they who have so well pleaded the cause of Protestants from scripture, would in baptism, as well as other things, have due regard to it. For as Mr. *Leavesly* says¹, "There was a magnanimity in the first reformers, that must always perpetuate their memories to the glory of God; and we should hope and pray, that the residue of that spirit may revive that work, and make a reformation flourish again." And that the reformation may be carried on to perfection, "² Let us be careful, as Dr. *Hunt* says, to observe whatever bears the stamp of divine authority. Let us not insolently make a religion for God, but receive it as he has deliver'd it us by reason and revelation; nor tamely take one from uninspired and fallible men. Whenever we are enquiring into the character of a true Christian, let us take the descriptions which are laid down by Christ and his apostles."

Let us follow the good advice of Dr. *Wright*³, "Be sure to read the scriptures till we are ready in them, and engage those about us, and all that are under our care to do so; or else the free use of our bible, in a language
" that

¹ Mr. *Leavesly* on Reformation, p. 27.

² Dr. *Hunt* on Penance, p. 37.

³ Dr. *Wright* on Scripture and Tradition, p. 51.

“ that *we* understand, is a privilege and blessing that will
 “ rise up in judgment against *us*. Let us watch against
 “ . . . every thing that would disgrace the scripture, con-
 “ sidering how great advantage is given to the practices of
 “ the *Romanists*, by departing from the scripture, either
 “ as a rule of faith or manners.”

Permit me to add in the words of Mr. *Bayes*, “¹ As we
 “ are enjoying these privileges, let us take care to make a
 “ due improvement of them ; let us endeavour to be well
 “ acquainted with the scriptures : this, among other ad-
 “ vantages we shall gain by it, will be our best defence
 “ against the errors of Popery ; for whatever the church
 “ of *Rome* may pretend, the greatest part of their religion
 “ has no foundation there. And in all our attendances
 “ on God in the duties of his worship, let us take care to
 “ behave with a suitable frame and temper of mind, re-
 “ membering that he is a spirit, and will be worshipped
 “ in spirit and truth, and can have no pleasure in those
 “ who draw nigh to him with their lips, while their
 “ hearts are far from him. This is a behaviour very un-
 “ becoming in any who profess to worship God ; but it
 “ will be more inexcusable in us, who are allowed the
 “ privilege of our own language, than in those who are
 “ obliged to worship in an unknown tongue.”

I have avoided citing any thing from Mr. *Burroughs*, be-
 cause he is a pastor of a congregation of Christians, who
 baptize according to what I believe to be the institution of
 Christ. However, I shall now transcribe one passage at
 the end of his Sermon, which he suitably address'd to the
 ministers, as follows : “ To conclude, Let us all, both
 “ ministers and people, converse daily with the sacred
 “ oracles, which will be our surest defence against cor-
 “ ruptions of all kinds. My reverend brethren in the
 “ ministry, I am satisfy'd, are too wise to be displeased
 “ at being put in mind of the importance of this duty, its
 “ importance to their establishment as Christians and
 “ Protestants, and to their usefulness as ministers. And
 “ if Christians in general would make it their practice to
 “ study the scriptures with impartial minds, we should
 “ have no alarms of Popery : for so long as this practice
 “ is kept up, it is impossible that the corrupt doctrines of
 “ the church of *Rome* should be entertain'd.”

I will

¹ Mr. *Bayes* on Worship in an unknown Tongue, p. 46, 47.

I will close all with that *immortal Paragraph* at the end of Dr. *Wright's* sermon: ' Which, whoever hears or
' reads as the language of one converted from Popery, by
' the study of the scriptures, cannot help being greatly
' moved with it, let him hear or read it ever so often.
' Addressing to a Writer of the *Roman* church, he thus
' summarily pleads the Protestant cause.

" Know then, Sir, that when I say the religion of
" Protestants is in prudence to be preferr'd before yours;
" as on the one side, I do not understand by your religion the doctrine of *Bellarmino*, or *Baronius*, or any
" other private men amongst you; nor the doctrine of
" the Sorbonne, or of the Jesuits, or of the Dominicans,
" or of any other particular company among you; but
" that wherein you all agree, or profess to agree, the
" doctrine of the council of *Trent*: so accordingly, on the
" other side, by the religion of Protestants, I do not understand the doctrine of *Luther*, or *Calvin*, or *Melancthon*,
" nor the confession of *Augusta*, or *Geneva*, nor the catechism of *Heidelberg*, nor the articles of the church of
" *England*, no, nor the harmony of Protestant confessions; but that wherein they all agree, and which they
" all subscribe with greater harmony, as a perfect rule of
" their faith and actions, that is, the bible.

" The bible, I say the bible only, is the religion of Protestants; whatsoever else they believe besides it, and the
" plain irrefragable and indubitable consequences of it, well
" may they hold as matter of opinion; but as matter of
" faith and religion, neither can they with coherence to
" their own grounds believe it themselves, nor require the
" belief of it of others, without most high and schismatical presumption. I, for my part, after a long and (as
" I verily believe and hope) impartial search of the true
" way to eternal happiness, do profess plainly that I cannot
" find any rest for the sole of my foot, but upon this rock
" only.

" I see plainly, and with mine own eyes, that there
" are popes against popes, councils against councils, some
" fathers against others, the same fathers against themselves, a consent of fathers of one age, against a consent
" of fathers of another age, the church of one age against the church of another age: Traditive interpretations of scripture are pretended, but there are few or
" none to be found: No tradition but only of scripture.

“ can derive itself from the fountain, but may be plainly
 “ proved to be brought in, in such an age after Christ, or
 “ that such an age it was not in. In a word, there is no sufficient
 “ certainty but of scripture only, for any considering
 “ man to build upon. This therefore, and this only I
 “ have reason to believe: This I will profess, according
 “ to this I will live; and for this, if there be occasion,
 “ I will not only willingly, but even gladly lose my
 “ life, though I should be sorry that Christians should
 “ take it from me.

“ Propose me any thing out of this book, and require
 “ whether I believe or no, and seem it never so incomprehensible
 “ to human reason, I will subscribe it with
 “ hand and heart, as knowing no demonstration can be
 “ stronger than this, God hath said so, therefore it is true.
 “ In other things, I will take no man's liberty of judging
 “ from him; neither shall any man take mine from me.
 “ I will think no man the worse man, nor the worse
 “ Christian, I will love no man the less, for differing in
 “ opinion from me. And what measure I mete to others,
 “ I expect from them again. I am fully assured that God
 “ does not, and therefore men ought not to require any
 “ more of any man than this, to believe the scripture to
 “ be God's word, to endeavour to find the true sense of it,
 “ and to live according to it.”

CHILLINGWORTH.

A P P E N.

APPENDIX.

HAVING in the preface to the third edition answered all the objections which I had ever heard against publishing this supplement, I shall now consider what some persons (besides the Author of the *Rebuke*, of whom I shall take some notice in the conclusion) have thought sufficient to silence us, when we plead so strenuously for a strict conformity to scripture in the ordinance of baptism.

First, They urge our *assembling together on the first day of the week for religious worship*. To this I answer, that they perform their publick worship on the same day; and must therefore either suppose they have scripture authority for so doing, or acknowledge that they have not, but only follow the tradition of later times. If they suppose the former, 'tis impertinent to object this to us in the debate about baptism, because we profess to make the scripture alone our rule in this ordinance. They cannot therefore consistently alledge this against us, unless they acknowledge that they have no scripture either for the observation of the first day, or for infant-sprinkling. And then I observe,

1st. That supposing there is no scripture for observing the first day, as they conceive, no judicious impartial man can ever think it a good argument, that, because we and they are both wrong in observing the first day of the week for which there is no scripture, they may therefore continue to err from scripture rule in the ordinance of baptism, against the clearest and plainest evidence that can be.

2^{dly}. I would ask, how they can upon this supposition justify their own observation of the first day, since they profess the scripture to be the rule of faith in opposition to the traditions of the church of *Rome*. They must either give over the observation of it as unscriptural, or yield the argument to Papists.

3^{dly}. What they think of the first day is nothing to us, who are satisfied that we have scripture for keeping the first day, as well as for administering baptism to believers only by immersion; and I may venture to tell them all, that when they can find as plain scripture for the sprinkling of infants, as for assembling together upon the first day of the week, we will give up the controversy. I will

therefore proceed to the scripture authority which we have to observe the first day of the week for the worship of God in Christian assemblies.

1. If we have no express precept in scripture for thus observing it, yet we are not without a scripture precedent, which I think has always been and is still allowed by both parties to be good authority. Acts xx. 7. *Upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow*: which shews us the practice of the first Christians, who with the apostle *Paul*, assembled together upon the first day of the week to break bread, at which time *Paul* preached unto them. It may here be noted,

1st. That the church of *Troas* came together in publick to break bread, and therefore this breaking bread is not to be understood of a common meal, but of the Lord's supper: which is the highest act of publick Christian worship, whereby Christians declare their faith in Jesus Christ, and their fellowship with one another. See 1 Cor. x. 16, 17.

2^{dly}. 'Tis plainly declared, that this breaking bread was the end of their coming together in publick on the first day. They did not meet together to hear St. *Paul* preach, and then take that occasion to break bread; but they assembled together to break bread, and then St. *Paul* took the opportunity which this gave him, to preach unto them before he departed.

3^{dly}. The manner, in which St. *Luke* relates their assembling together, intimates that it was the usual custom of the church at *Troas*, to celebrate the Lord's supper on the first day of the week. *Upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them.*

4^{thly}. It was not the practice of this church to perform their publick worship on the seventh day. For if this had been their stated day for publick worship, why did they not come together on this day to celebrate the Lord's supper? It cannot be pretended that they deferr'd it till the first day, that St. *Paul* might have an opportunity of preaching to them; for 'tis remarkable that he and his companions abode at *Troas* seven days; and therefore they might have had an opportunity of hearing him upon other days, or even on that day, if they had then met together to break bread according to custom. We have not indeed in the whole *Acts of the Apostles* any account that the Christians perform'd their publick worship on the seventh day.

day. We are often told that the apostles enter'd into the synagogue on this day, in order to preach Christ to the Jews; but we have no instance that any church assembled thereon for that worship which was peculiar to Christians.

2. If ever it was a custom for the church in the apostles times to meet together upon the seventh day, there is great reason to believe that they principally observed, and had the most numerous assemblies upon, the first day of the week; because St. Paul recommends it as the most proper time for the churches to make their collections for the poor saints. *1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2. Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given orders to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come.* By which I think we may very fairly understand,

1st. That St. Paul calls this laying by in store a collection.

2^{dly}. That he advises the Christians at *Corinth*, when they went to the publick service upon the first day of the week, to take along with them for the poor saints according as God had prospered them, and then put it into the common store or treasury of the church; that it might be there in readiness, and so prevent the trouble of a gathering when the apostle himself should come amongst them.

3^{dly}. That they who look upon this only as a reckoning day, for every Christian to lay by something at home, forget that there would be as much occasion for a gathering when the apostle came, as if this exhortation had never been given them: which is directly contrary to the reason he urges for this weekly collection upon the first day, *That there be no gatherings when I come.*

4^{thly}. That this precept was not peculiar to the church at *Corinth*, but had before been given to other churches, and very probably was general to all churches where such collections were made. *Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given orders to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come.* But,

3. That particular day which the first Christians observed in honour of their Lord and Master's resurrection, and in which they met to celebrate one of his most solemn institutions, the breaking of bread in commemoration of his death and sufferings, is by S. John dignified

dignified with the high and honourable name of the Lord's day, *Rev. i. 10. I was in the Spirit on the Lord's-day.* And this name was given to it, as *Ignatius* (who was cotemporary with *St. John*) assures us, on account of its being observed by Christians in memory of the resurrection of our Lord;¹ which also is confirmed by *Barnabas*, who was *Paul's* companion;² and also by *Justin Martyr*;³ see also *Acts ii. 1, 2, 3, 4.* From all which it appears that this practice began amongst the apostles and disciples of our Lord very soon after his ascension, and was attended on the day of *Pentecost* with the most glorious manifestation of the divine favour and acceptance, that was ever heard of. *When the day of Pentecost⁴ was fully come, they were all together with one accord in one place, &c.* Could the Pædobaptists produce as good evidence that infant-sprinkling was of apostolical original, we should comply with it. Let them give an instance of but one infant being sprinkled, or even baptized by the apostles; give but one instance of its being their practice from *Clemens*, *Barnabas*, *Polycarp*, *Hermas*, or *Ignatius*; and the dispute is at an end. But with respect to the observation of the first day, 'tis plain we have both precedent for it in scripture, and evidence for it likewise in the first and purest antiquity: So that these two things cannot be fairly supposed to stand and fall together; nor need we give up the one in order to defend the other.

The *second* thing objected against us as being without scripture authority, is our admitting women to communicate with us when we celebrate the Lord's supper in remembrance of him. To which I answer:

1st. They are members of the body of Christ, admitted and received into his church by baptism, *Acts v. 14. viii. 12. xvi. 13, 14, 15. and xvii. 4, 12, 34.* And we are assured, *Gal. iii. 27, 28.* That *as many as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ: That there is neither Jew nor Greek; there is neither bond nor free; there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.* Where the apostle seems to point out a difference between the Mosaic and Christian dispensations; that tho' females were excluded the ordinance of circumcision under the law, yet under the gospel they should

¹ *To the Magnesians §. 9.* ² *Cath. Ep. §. 15.* ³ *Apol. §. 87. 89.*

⁴ *The 50th day from the waving of the sheaf at the feast of harvest, being the morrow after the seventh sabbath. See Lev. xxiii. 10. &c. and Ainsworth's Annot. on ver. 16.*

should be admitted to equal privileges with males, there being now no manner of distinction of sexes in respect to the ordinances of Christ, for we are all one in Christ Jesus. Now from hence 'tis plain, that women are not excluded from this ordinance of Christ any more than they are from baptism; and therefore ought, as well as the males, to commemorate the dying love of our dear Redeemer in his holy supper.

2dly, 'Tis said, *Acts* i. 14. *These all* (viz. the apostles just before mentioned) *continued with one accord in prayer and supplication, with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren:* and in the 15th verse they are all called *disciples:* and the number of their names together were about 120. In the second chapter and first verse 'tis said, *They were all together with one accord in one place:* and verse 41. *The same day there were added unto them* [viz. the church, consisting of these 120 men and women] *about 3000 souls.* After which, ver. 42. it is said of them all in general, that *they continued stedfastly in the apostles doctrine, and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers.* This therefore is a scripture proof of womens receiving, and consequently right to receive the Lord's supper.

3dly, The apostle in his exhortation to the *Corinthian* church concerning this very ordinance, 1 *Ep.* xi. 28. uses a word which includes both sexes; but it is not very likely that he would have done so, if the Lord's supper had been wholly confined to one sex: *Let a man* (says he) *examine himself; and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup.* Where the word *Anthropos*, which is translated *Man*, signifies either man or woman: so that the words properly intend, Let all persons, whether men or women, examine themselves, and so let them eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. And therefore if the apostle had known the Lord's supper was limited to males only, he would hardly have used a word which is known to comprehend the other sex. I would ask, Whether women are not included in *Heb.* ix. 27. *It is appointed unto men* [*Anthropois*] *once to die, but after this the judgment.* But this is so trite an observation, that it will be as inexcusable in me to enlarge upon it, as it is ridiculous in any to make the objection. And as womens right to this privilege was never disputed in any age that I know of, so the first and purest antiquity is very express in their favour.¹ We have no reason therefore to give up

¹ *Constitut. Ap.* l. ii. c. 57. l. viii. c. 13.

womens right to the Lord's supper, or else to give up the controversy relating to the baptism of the adult only. Let but the Pædobaptists give the same proof for infant-baptism, as we can for womens receiving the eucharist, and we shall soon turn Pædobaptists.

There are three things more which the author of the *Rebuke*, for want of knowing and understanding the scriptures, and the nature of the Christian dispensation, has objected against us. Namely, That we allow of a Christian magistracy, That we do not refuse to take an Oath before the civil magistrate when lawfully called to it, and That we will go to law for the recovery of our just right. But these things being of a civil nature, and having no manner of relation to the constitution of a Christian church, nor to the publick worship and service of God in religious assemblies; as I am unwilling to trouble the reader with trifling and unprofitable disputes, I shall let them pass. But since he wishes I had quoted the text or texts of scripture where baptism is appointed to be administred by immersion, I shall observe, for the sake of such as do not know it, that the *Greek* words which relate to that holy ordinance, are not in our bibles translated into the *English* tongue, but only accommodated to our speech by altering the terminations, and are now, by time and use, made *English*. But if they had been translated, where-ever we now meet with baptize we should have read dip; for baptized, dipped; for baptism and baptizing, dipping; and where-ever we read *John* the *Baptist*, it would have been *John* the *Dipper*: even as the *Dutch* have translated the original words. And this rendering exactly suits with the account which the scripture gives us of the manner in which *John* baptized our Saviour, and in which *Philip* baptized the Eunuch. See p. 35, 36, 37. and therefore the *Rebucker* impertinently wishes for a scripture, where baptism is appointed to be administred by immersion: which is the same thing as to ask, where dipping is appointed to be administred by dipping. But we are commanded to initiate proselytes into the church of Christ by dipping, *Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing, or, as it should have been rendered, dipping them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the World. Amen.*

BESIDES the objections already answered, I have found that the conceit of *Socinus*, adopted by Mr. *Emlyn* in his *Previous Question*, is now revived by some dissenting Pædobaptists. They imagine "That Christian baptism
 " was only intended by our Lord Jesus Christ for such as
 " became proselytes to Christianity, from an infidel state :
 " And that none of the posterity of Christians descended
 " from baptized parents or ancestors in a continued Chri-
 " stian line, not interrupted by open apostasy from
 " Christianity, are bound by Christ's institution to be
 " baptized." ¹ This I look upon to be the last shift to which they are driven, who own the Christian religion to be true, but are unwilling to be baptized. And I think Christians must be hard press'd indeed when they take up with this hypothesis. For,

1. 'Tis entirely unscriptural ; neither the commission of our Lord nor any other place of holy writ intimates any such thing. If we consider the commission, *Matt.* xxviii. 19. *Go teach all nations baptizing them* ; there is not one single word which limits baptism to proselytes and their children born before they believed, nor the least intimation that their future descendents were not to be baptized : Which is very strange, if Christian baptism was not intended by our Lord for such as descend from Christian parents. Nay, had this been his intent, such a limitation had not only been proper but even necessary, because he lays this down as the rule which his disciples were to observe with respect to baptism : And this appears from his ordering them every thing so circumstantially, first to instruct, then to baptize the nations ; and always to administer baptism in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. And since Christ has made no limitation, and no man hath a right to do it, we conclude that the descendents of Christians ought to be baptized, because it is the duty of all men to observe Christ's laws and precepts in their utmost extent. And as the commission doth not limit baptism to proselytes and their children born before conversion, so there is no such limitation in any other passage of the new testament. The scriptures speak of faith and repentance as the only prerequisites to baptism, and never make it necessary thereunto that a person should be born of unbelieving parents ; which is plain from these texts, *Mark* xvi. 15, 16. *Go*

M

ye

¹ *Previous Question*, Mr. *Emlyn's Tracts*, p. 429, 435.

ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. *He that [or whosoever] believeth and is baptized shall be saved.* And *Acts* viii. 37. *If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayst [be baptized.]* On which see p. 12, 13. On this account also baptism is called *the washing of regeneration*, *Titus* iii. 5. Because reformation, or a resolution to live a new life, is necessary in order to it. See *Rom.* vi. And this is confirmed, *Heb.* vi. 1, 2. where *repentance from dead works and faith towards God* are placed in their natural order before *the doctrine of baptisms*. Thus the scriptures naturally lead us to conceive that every one who believes and repents is to be baptized, nothing else being any where required in order to baptism; whereas had it been our Saviour's will that the descendents of baptized parents should not be baptized, it would have been mentioned in these or some other scriptures, tho' it was omitted in the commission. This was necessary to prevent mistakes, that Christians might not give baptism to their children contrary to the intention of Christ; and for want of this, we find Christians in all ages for 17 centuries have run into a wrong practice, if what these gentlemen say be true. But, as Mr. *Locke* somewhere says, *He that believes without having any reason for believing, may be in love with his own fancies; but neither seeks truth as he ought, nor pays the obedience due to his Maker.* And I confess the constant usage of the Christian church from the apostolical time, is to me an evident sign that they are in the wrong.

2. This hypothesis is not only unsupported by scripture, but also contradicts the commission of our Lord in two particulars. For, *first*, it supposes the commission to teach is larger than that to baptize, whereas they are really of equal extent. *Go teach all nations, baptizing them*; and therefore if the posterity of Christian parents are not to be baptized, neither are they to be taught; for if the commission authorises the one, it orders the other also. And, *secondly*, the authors of this hypothesis suppose that not only proselytes who have been taught and have believed, but their uninstructed children born before their conversion, are likewise to be baptized. But tho' the commission of our Lord authorises persons to baptize such as receive their instructions, yet it giveth no liberty to baptize one single person [whether born of Christian or of unbelieving parents] who is not instructed and doth not receive the
Christian

Christian faith, and therefore for any to baptize the untaught infants of profelytes, is to go beyond, nay, to contradict the commission of our Lord; who only commands to baptize such as have been first taught. For these words, *Go teach all nations, baptizing them*, can never be made to signify that any who are untaught are to be baptized; till it can be shewn that the relative contains more than the antecedent, or that *them* means not only them, but them and their uninstructed infants. Besides, all the instances which are recorded in scripture, of persons converted to the Christian faith, are quite contrary to this hypothesis, as you may see at large from p. 6. to p. 21.

3. This hypothesis supposes that baptism was not intended to be perpetual; but whensoever any nation became Christian, there it ought to have ceased; which I think is as contrary to the scripture as the former: For when our Lord commanded his disciples to *Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*; he immediately adds, *And lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world*, Matt. xxviii. 20. which words as they here stand connected, fairly imply the promise of Christ's presence and favour to the ministers of the gospel, in the administration of this ordinance, to the world's end. And indeed the perpetuity of baptism seemeth to be as fully and as strongly implied in this promise, by the words *alway, even unto the end of the world*; as the continuance of the Lord's supper till his second coming, appears to be, either in the words of institution, or in 1 Cor. xi. 26. *As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come*. And therefore if any Christians do not think themselves obliged by the commission to be baptized, I know not but they may in a little time think themselves at liberty to lay aside the other ordinance also. But I hope they will consider better of it, since if they give up these ordinances of Christ, they will very much countenance the growth of Deism, and will themselves be in great danger of degenerating into Infidelity.

Moreover, that baptism was not only designed for profelytes to the Christian faith, but is also to be continued down to their latest posterity, appeareth from *Acts* ii. 38, 39. *Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy*

Ghost: for the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. From whence we have ground to think, that the promise of the Spirit belongs to the future posterity of baptized Christians, on no other condition than that they repent and submit to baptism for the remission of sins. Furthermore, if it was an argument to the *Jewish* converts to repent and be baptized for the remission of sins, that the promise belonged to them; is it not also an argument that their latest posterity should comply with the same duties? *For the promise, says St. Peter, is to you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.*

4. The practice of the church in all ages is against this hypothesis; the proof of which, with respect to the primitive church, is clear from these passages cited by Mr. *Emlyn*, in his postscript, from *Justin Martyr* and *The Constitutions of the Apostles*; which declare that none were admitted to the Lord's supper who had not been personally baptized.* “*Justin Martyr*, in his “*Apology*, speaking of the eucharist, says, To which “none is admitted, but who believes our doctrine to be “true, having been washed in the laver of regeneration “for the remission of sins, and living as Christ has taught. “As many as being convinced do believe the things we “teach, and promise to live according to them, after “prayer and fasting, are led by us to the water, and are “regenerated after the same manner as we also were, “To the same purpose, says the *Constit. Ap.* Let none eat “of these things who is not initiated, but those only “who have been baptized into the death of the Lord. “But if any one (not initiated) is a partaker thro’ ignorance, instruct him quickly, and initiate him, that he “may not go out and despise you.” These testimonies Mr. *Emlyn* owns to be of some weight; and tho’ he seems to judge them not decisive, by calling them *general expressions*, I think they are as particular, and as express, as can be desired; and altho’ he may not see, I am apt to think every impartial reader will, of what moment they are in this controversy.

However, Mr. *E.* cites another passage from the *Constit.* which he thinks is more determinate: The words are these: “Baptize your infants, and bring them up in the
“nurture

* p. 456, 457.

“nurture and admonition of the Lord.” After which he adds, “Which if spoken, as I think they are, of proper infants in age, will, I confess, shew the continued use of baptism, in Christians posterity, to be intended, &c.” In this I cannot but commend his candor, tho’ I admire he should make the least doubt whether proper infants in age, or metaphorical infants in innocency or manners, are intended; since this chapter of the *Constitut.* speaking to parents, says, *Do you also baptize your infants:* Which plainly intimates that they intended proper infants, not as yet under their own, but their parents care. But then, according to the directions given in this book, wherever baptism is treated of, we must here necessarily understand infants capable of being catechumens, about 10 or 14 years old; to which ages infancy was then extended, as Dr. Gale, after Mr. Dodwell, hath learnedly shewn³: And ’tis well known that the laws of England call and account all persons infants who are under the age of 21 years. So that I differ from Mr. Emlin, when he adds, that this passage speaks of little infants before instruction. And tho’ this makes no alteration with respect to the subject we are upon, Whether the posterity of Christians are to be baptized; yet because he supposeth that this very antient book favours what is commonly called infant baptism, I shall endeavour to shew his mistake.

I judge that they are not new born infants, but children capable of instruction, which are here intended; not only because there is nothing in all the *Constitutions* which in the least favours his sense of this place, but also for this very good reason, That whereas there is in the *Constitutions*, L. vii. c. 40, &c. an office for the baptism of adult persons who have been instructed, there is no office appointed for baptizing new born infants incapable of instruction, nor for catechising and confirming any children who were baptized without instruction: And therefore when the *Constitutions* speak here of infants, we must necessarily understand catechised infants; because had any other been admitted to baptism, the authors would have provided an office suited to their condition. But let us examine Mr. Emlin’s reasons for the contrary opinion.

1st. “That these *ννπτα*, or little children, are distinct from the catechumens, the baptizing of whom is made another distinct article, which follows, chap. 18. In-

“*στρουκ*”

³ *Reflections on Wall*, p. 501, 502.

“*instruēt the catechumens in the elements of religion, and baptize them.*” Had this article been inserted immediately before or after the words *baptize your infants*, Mr. *Emlyn* would have had a much better pretence for what he says; but it is three chapters after it. Besides, this article concerning the catechumens, if it be a distinct article at all, is not only an article distinct from that of the infants, but also from that of the grown persons. And I presume Mr. *Emlyn* will not say that the grown persons, who are advised not to delay their baptism, are mentioned as distinct from the catechumens. In chap. 15. persons are advised neither to delay their own baptism, nor to neglect bringing their children to it. But the 18th chapter is address’d to the priest thus: “*Instruēt the catechumens in the elements of religion, and then baptize them.*” Where the priest is ordered not to admit any catechumen, whether old or young, to baptism, without previous instruction; and therefore the catechumens here must comprehend both the grown persons and the infants, mentioned in the 15th chapter.

2dly. Mr. *Emlyn* saith, “The method prescribed is different; the catechumens were first to be instructed, and then baptized; but these infants were to be baptized, and then instructed: these seem to me to be the children of christian parents, and the other to be profelytes.” But I observe, chap. 15. only ordereth that baptism be not delayed, without concerning itself, Whether instruction should precede or no. This is so plainly the method of this chapter, that it says nothing about instructing even the adult before baptism; and yet I suppose none will therefore say that the *Constitutions* direct grown persons to be baptized without teaching them. This being the case, Why should Mr. *Emlyn* argue from their silence, with respect to previous instruction of infants, that they ought to be baptized without being first taught? For the infants here directed to be baptized, might be instructed before, notwithstanding the silence of the *Constitutions* in this chapter, both with respect to them, and the grown persons also; and therefore the method to be taken with these infants and the catechumens, doth not appear from hence to be different: For tho’, as Mr. *Emlyn* owns, the *Constitutions* direct the parents to instruct their infants after they are baptized, yet this will not prove them distinct from the catechumens in the 18th chapter, who were to be instructed before

fore baptism. For, according to our Lord's commission, all persons were first to be taught, then to be baptized, and afterwards to be further instructed. *Matth. xxviii. 19, 20. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, &c.* And certainly, let children be ever so well instructed before baptism, it will still be the parents duty, whilst they are under their care, to bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. But Mr. *Emlyn* observes,

3dly. "There is a difference in the phrase, *your infants*, and only *the catechumens*; to express a nearer and "more natural propriety in the one, as parents, than in the "other." This again is for want of considering that the former is address'd to parents not to neglect their childrens baptism; but when the latter is address'd to the priest concerning the same persons, it would have been ridiculous not to have alter'd the phrase, and said, *the catechumens*. And all his arguments to prove infants here intends uncatechized infants, are weak, while a baptismal office, suited to their state, is wanting: Nor is it likely such an office would have been wanting in a book which abounds with ecclesiastical offices, for all ordinary occasions at least; and therefore if infant baptism had then been practised, an office, which would have been wanted not only every year and every month, but every week and every day, would never have been omitted. But I think nothing more need be said to end this dispute; and therefore I'll return to the argument I was upon, and add another testimony or two to those I have already transcribed from Mr. *Emlyn*, which plainly shew what was the judgment of the primitive church.

It appears from *Tertullian* to have been the practice of the primitive church, in and before his time, for the believing posterity of believing parents to be anew enrolled in Christ by baptism. * "So there is almost no being "born clean, that is of Heathens. For hence the "apostle says, That of either parent sanctified, the children that are born are holy by reason of the prerogative of that seed, and also the instruction in their education; else, says he, were they unclean. But yet "meaning to be understood thus, That the children of "the

* *Tertullian de Anima*, c. 39, 40. cited by Dr. Wall, p. 22.

“ the faithful [*or baptized believers*] are [*not born holy,*
 “ *or actually holy, by any other means before baptism, but*]
 “ designed for [*future*] holiness [*on baptism*]. . . . other-
 “ wise he knew well enough what our Lord had deter-
 “ mined ; *Except one be born of water and the Spirit, he*
 “ *shall not enter into the kingdom of God ;* i. e. he shall
 “ not be holy. Thus every soul [*whether born of Chri-*
 “ *stians or Heathens*] is reckoned as in *Adam*, so long till
 “ it be anew enrolled in Christ, and so long unclean till
 “ it be so enrolled, and sinful because unclean.” Do not
 these words prove, that the baptism of such as were born
 of Christian parents was then so general and ancient, that
 in *Tertullian’s* opinion, even the apostle, when he saith,
Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy,
 could not mean that they were holy before they were
 baptized ; because he supposes that *St. Paul* must needs
 know this would contradict our Saviour’s assertion, *Ex-*
cept one be born of water and of the Spirit, he shall not
enter into the kingdom of God, i. e. be holy.

This passage of *Tertullian* Mr. *Emlyn* hath⁵ quoted
 only from *Dr. Wall* ; but he has made it look some-
 thing to his purpose by altering it, and leaving out one
 half. For instance, in this sentence, *But yet meaning*
to be understood thus, he leaves out about two lines, be-
 sides the words *But yet*, which much weakens the force
 of the passage against him. Then he leaves out about
 two lines more ; and this other sentence, *Otherwise*
the apostle knew well enough our Lord’s decree, he al-
 ters to quite another sense, *Otherwise he would have*
mingled them of the Lord’s decree ; and then he leaves out
 the last decisive words, which serve to clear the whole :
 “ Thus every soul is reckoned in *Adam*, so long till it be
 “ anew enrolled in Christ, and so long unclean until it
 “ be enrolled, and sinful because unclean.” So that,
 all things consider’d, it was prudent in Mr. *Emlyn* to
 say,⁶ *Be his* (*Tertullian’s*) *meaning what it will,---I*
build not on it : For ’tis easy to see how much it makes
 against him, when truly represented ; as does also what
 he says in his *Apology*, *That men are not born but made*
*Christians.*⁷ On which account most probably it was,
 that Mr. *Emlyn* gives *Dr. Wall* some reasons why he
 should not rely upon *Tertullian’s* judgment or advice : Be-
 cause ’tis not very favourable for early infant-baptism, or
 for appropriating the act to the clergy : With which rea-
 sons

⁵ p. 443.⁶ *ibid.*⁷ Ch. xviii. *Reeve’s Apol.* p. 226. Vol. I.

sons the Anti-pædobaptists have nothing to do, because herein we are on *Tertullian's* side. But when he says "That *Tertullian* is not to be minded in a business wherein he writes with so much uncertainty and inconsistency, and was certainly in the wrong, either in allowing the baptism of infants, or in pleading for the delay of baptism to riper years, by such arguments as he uses;" 'tis surprising that Mr. *Emlyn* durst assert that *Tertullian* allowed of infant-baptism, and in the very next words own that he pleads against it. What those words of *Tertullian* are, in which he allows of it, I am not certain; but I suppose this assertion is founded upon the following passage, in which there is a various reading: *For what need is there that the godfathers should be brought into danger?* Instead of which Dr. *Wall* says, * in some (which he takes to be the truer) copies it is said, "*For what need is there unless in cases of necessity, &c.* implying, that in cases of danger they ought indeed to be baptized without delay: But the tautology of these words seems very impertinent; as if *Tertullian* had argued thus: Either there is some necessity, or there is no necessity; if there is no necessity, then what necessity is there? For the passage, as Mr. *Wall* would read it, will run exactly thus: *What necessity is there, unless there be a necessity?* *Pamelius*, upon whose authority Mr. *Wall* builds, confesses he has it only from *Gagnæus*, whose single judgment is not sufficient. *Rigaltius* notes, that copies differ; and says that the old *Paris* edition, meaning that of *Gagnæus*, (but without adding any other that does so too) foolishly repeats the word *necesse*: And *Grotius*, observing the same variety, confesses *he can't see what tolerable sense those words can have*; and therefore he leaves 'em out as spurious. And till better authorities can be produced to confirm that reading, we shall think the repetition too silly for *Tertullian*, and therefore reject it;" and not make him that inconsistent writer which Mr. *Emlyn* would have him thought. But as the words here interpolated rely only on *Gagnæus's* credit, I shall just observe that he was a shameless editor, who took a liberty to add or to alter what he pleased in the treatise concerning the Trinity ascribed to *Novatian*, as appears from *Pamelius's* edition of the same piece from the MSS. See Mr. *Whiston's Account of the primitive faith*, p. 58.

N

After

* Dr. *Gale's Reflect. on Wall*, p. 511.

After this time, Mr. *Emlyn* owns, *Cyprian* and the general practice of the church were ever opposite to his opinion; and, till *Socinus*, names none who were of his sentiments: So that more citations are not necessary. However, you shall have one more from *Optatus*, which I was helped to by a friend, and is sufficiently express. He says, *L. iv. p. 124. Ed. 1599*, " Every Christian knows, that all men who are born, even tho' it be of Christian parents, are possessed with a worldly spirit, which must necessarily be cast out and removed before they are admitted to baptism." It appears therefore, that the judgment and practice of the whole church, and especially the most ancient, are on our side: Which in a case like this, where it must be owned, not only that the scriptures may be interpreted as we contend they should, but also that ours is the most natural and obvious sense of the commission, &c. in such a case, I say, it must be confessed an argument much in our favour, that no other sense from the earliest times till very lately was ever dreamt of; but on the contrary, all the churches gathered and settled by the apostles and their successors, for 15 or 1600 years, have always understood the commission as we do now. And I think thus much must be granted us at least, That the certain practice of Christians for the second, third, and fourth centuries, who pretend in this point to follow the commission of our Lord and the practice of his apostles, is a better rule whereby to interpret the commission of our Saviour, than the uncertain practice of the *Jews*, who, whatever baptism they had, never pretended to make Christ's commission their directory. What folly therefore is it to search after Christian baptism amongst the later *Jews*, when you may so easily find it amongst the more ancient Christians! This naturally leads me to observe,

5. That the foundation of this hypothesis is weak and wants authority, for 'tis built on the fable of the *Jewish* baptism; whence 'tis argued: " 9 Our Saviour's command to baptize, being general, must in all reason be supposed to mean, that it should be done according to the known common practice of baptism,....which his disciples well understood, and had been acquainted with: Otherwise it had been most necessary for our Lord Jesus to have made such exceptions from the general

9 Previous question, *Emlyn's Tracts*, p. 430, 437.

“ neral method of practice, and such new rules as his
 “ disciples were to observe. Now 'tis known how the
 “ *Jews* must needs understand such a precept, viz. ac-
 “ cording to their own usage, which was to baptize pro-
 “ felytes and their children born in infidelity, but not
 “ any descended from them: And therefore let us go
 “ and do likewise.” Thus the patrons of infant-baptism
 find their most favourite argument extended beyond their
 intentions, even to the laying aside that practice, for the
 support of which it was at first invented. But I remark,

1st. The *Jewish* baptism of profelytes was not so an-
 tient as is pretended, if it was not of very short stand-
 ing in the time of the *Jewish* Rabbins who mention it.
 The *Mischna*, in which it is supposed to be first men-
 tioned, was not compiled till about 220, nor the *Gemera*
 till 5 or 600 years after our blessed Lord; which is not
 sufficient evidence that it was used before, or in his time;
 tho' some of the Rabbins pretend that it was as ancient
 as the times of *Moses*. But I have made it appear in the
Supplement, p. 30 to 34, that it was not so antient as the
 times of *John* the Baptist and our Saviour Jesus Christ:
 And the evidence we have produced from *John* i. 19 to
 28, where 'tis affirmed that *the Jews asked John, Why*
baptizest thou then, if thou be not the Christ, nor Elias,
neither that prophet? Mr. *Emlyn* could no otherwise
 avoid, than by supposing (p. 432, 433.) That the que-
 stion was not, *Why baptizest thou in general*, as the text
 affirms; but, *Why baptizest or profelytest thou amongst*
the Jews; of which the evangelist hath not one syllable:
 And yet he “ takes it for a strong presumption----for the
 “ antient practice of baptism among the *Jews*; which
 “ ties the argument so hard, that the Antipædobaptists
 “ cannot solve it.” Whereas on the contrary this text
 expressly destroys the credit of any baptism amongst the
Jews so early.

I can't but add, here that Dr. *Gale* has shewn that the
 words in the *Mischna*, which is the first pretended proof,
 may be understood of a purification from uncleanness,
 and not of an initiatory baptism. And as to the *Jewish*
 Rabbins he says, p. 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, and 370,
 371. “ They who have read their writings against
 “ the *Christians*, must have observ'd they ridicule the
 “ sacrament of baptism as an unaccountable and fanciful
 “ ceremony. The anonymous author of the antientest
 “ *Nizzachon* frequently touches upon it with his usual

“ gall, and wou’d expose it as very absurd and foolish;
 “ which to me is a clear argument he did not apprehend our baptism was borrow’d from the *Jews*; nay,
 “ he argues against it in one place, p. 53. where he
 “ says, *It is no where commanded to plunge persons or*
 “ *profelytes into the water. Why therefore does Jesus*
 “ *command to do so?* The author must needs be understood to speak here of the baptism of profelytes; for
 “ he could not have said in general of all other baptisms, they are no where commanded. In another place,
 “ p. 192. attempting to shew the insignificancy and
 “ uselessness of our sacred institution, he says, *From*
 “ *what sin or uncleanness does this baptism purify?*
 “ *What sin or pollution is there in infant-children that*
 “ *ye baptize them?* His opposing our baptism so eagerly,
 “ must import they had no such thing in use among
 “ them. The whole page indeed is to our purpose, but
 “ there are two or three words I can’t well pass by:
 “ the Rabbin had said, that Christians ought to be circumcised in imitation of *Christ* and his *Apostles*, as
 “ well as baptized in imitation of them: to which, in
 “ the name of the Christians, he makes this objection,
 “ *That Christ came to renew the law, and that he had laid*
 “ *aside or abolished circumcision, but instituted baptism.*
 “ The Rabbin’s blasphemous answer to this shall not be
 “ repeated, as making nothing to the point; only we
 “ may observe, the objection places the rise and validity
 “ of baptism in *Christ*’s institution; and the *Jew* does
 “ not, in contradiction, say, it was borrow’d from
 “ them; or that since it had been a practice under their
 “ dispensation, there was as much reason to abolish that
 “ as circumcision, or the like: for a cavilling, quarrel-
 “ some *Jew* might have said a hundred such idle things
 “ on this occasion, if he had understood that *Christ*
 “ adopted the ceremony from them. *On the contrary*
 “ he expressly fixes the rise of the practice in *Christ* and
 “ St. *John* his forerunner; for p. 195. he makes these
 “ trifling reflections on *John*’s baptism, and the words
 “ in *Matth.* iii. 5, 6. *But what signify’d all this?*
 “ *Who gave John power and authority to institute this*
 “ *baptism?* *Upon what law could he ground the fancy?*
 “ *Neither on the old nor new.* Had it been a custom
 “ among themselves, ’twou’d have been easy to see from
 “ whence St. *John* deriv’d it, and the Rabbin would
 “ not have fail’d to put us in mind how much we were
 “ beholden

“ beholden to them for the substantial ceremonies of our
 “ religion; and that we copy’d our rite of initiation
 “ from their traditions.

“ In another place, p. 221. upon the story of the
 “ young man who asked our Lord, what he must do to
 “ inherit eternal life, *Mark* x. 17, &c. this same writer
 “ observes, that *Christ does not command him to be*
 “ *baptized*, nor take any notice of that novel invention,
 “ *but only inculcates to him the old commandments.*
 “ By which opposition of *old commandments to baptism*,
 “ he plainly signifies, that he took the baptism of
 “ *Christ* to be a new institution of his own, and something
 “ singular too, or at least not used by themselves;
 “ else he would not have been so much disturb’d at it,
 “ and argued against it so frequently. He mentions
 “ baptism also as the initiation peculiar to Christians,
 “ and opposes to it circumcision only, as the initiation
 “ of proselytes to *Judaism*. The passage is longer than
 “ I am willing to transcribe, and therefore I refer you
 “ to the book itself, p. 242, 243, and 251.

“ The sense however is much the same with what
 “ Rabbi *Isaac* has express’d, *Chissuk Emunah*, p. 401. in
 “ these words: *They have abrogated circumcision, and*
 “ *substituted baptism in its stead; as they have likewise*
 “ *done with the sabbath, instead of which they observe*
 “ *the first day of the week.*

“ This is exceeding plain; for as they kept a new day
 “ instead of the antient one, so he says they have in like
 “ manner substituted a new ceremony of initiation instead
 “ of the old one: nay, in the very next words
 “ he complains the Christians *have abolish’d the whole*
 “ *law, and all the divine precepts which the law*
 “ *makes necessary, except only some things in relation to*
 “ *incest, &c.* Here he enumerates some of the moral
 “ precepts, but does not mention baptism at all; which
 “ therefore I argue was, in this author’s judgment, no
 “ institution of *Moses*, nor practis’d by the *Jews* before
 “ *Christ*, because he asserts the Christians had abolish’d
 “ all rites besides those excepted, in the number of
 “ which he has not placed baptism.

“ And when some Christians had objected to the
 “ *Jews*, that they only circumcised the males, without
 “ using any initiatory ceremony for females, whereas the
 “ Christians by baptism initiate both sexes: If the *Jews*
 “ had used baptism, they might have reply’d, they
 “ did

“ did as much as the Christians ; and yet the author of
 “ *Nizzachon* does not make the least mention of it, but
 “ turns off the objection another way.

“ In the next place I observe, that there is no in-
 “ stance or mention of this baptism, in any authen-
 “ tick antient history. I must take this for granted,
 “ till such a one is produced ; and that it has not yet
 “ been done, is a great presumption that none can be
 “ found. Nay, it may be prov'd as well as a negative
 “ can be, that there was no such practice ; because in
 “ the accounts of the proselytism of some, when the
 “ historians had the fairest occasion in the world to
 “ take notice of it, they have mentioned circumcision,
 “ without so much as glancing at this pretended bap-
 “ tism. Thus *Josephus* informs us, that *Hyrchanus*,
 “ after having subdued the *Idumæans*, made and initi-
 “ ated 'em *Jews*, by circumcision only ; for had any
 “ thing else been as necessary, *Hyrchanus* would have
 “ performed it, and the judicious historian would not
 “ have forgot to mention it : But since he has not left the
 “ least intimation of it, I reckon we have the double
 “ authority, viz. of *Hyrchanus*, who was high-priest, and
 “ of *Josephus* on our side. The historian's own words
 “ run thus : ¹ *Hyrchanus also took Adora and Marissa ;*
 “ *and having subdued all Idumæa, he gave the inhabi-*
 “ *tants leave to continue in that country, on condition they*
 “ *would be circumcised, and observe the laws and cus-*
 “ *toms of the Jews. They therefore, unwilling to be*
 “ *expel'd their native country, receiv'd circumcision, and*
 “ *led their lives according to the manner of the Jews.*
 “ And in another place he tells us, that *Aristobulus*,
 “ son of the above-named *Hyrchanus*, caus'd the *Itu-*
 “ *reans* to be made proselytes by circumcision, and says
 “ nothing of baptism. ² *He oblig'd them that wou'd stay*
 “ *in the land to be circumcised, and live according to*
 “ *the laws and customs of the Jews.* And *Philo*, ano-
 “ ther considerable author, is in like manner wholly
 “ silent of this baptism. To be sure, if there had
 “ been any thing in these, or such like authors, we
 “ should have heard of it over and over ; but their
 “ silence, even when they are profess'dly giving an
 “ account of the customs and antiquities of the *Jews*,
 “ is a very weighty consideration, and ought to go a
 “ great

¹ *Antiqu. Judaic. lib. 13. c. 17. p. 450.*

² *Ibid. lib. 13. c. 19. p. 455.*

“ great way toward demonstrating, that no such thing
 “ either was or ought to be practised. An instance of
 “ this nature I remember also in *Ganz*, one of the best
 “ historians among the Rabbins : At the year 3670, he
 “ says, *many great and powerful cities became the allies*
 “ *of Alexander, the brother of Aristobulus, and were*
 “ *circumcised*; and never mentions any other part of
 “ the initiation.

“ What has been said, makes it, I think, very
 “ clear,

“ 1st. That the passages Mr. *Wall* cites from the text
 “ of the *Talmud*, may only speak of baptism for puri-
 “ fication, *from the blood of circumcision, with*
 “ *which the patient is suppos'd to be defil'd*; and
 “ not of baptism for proselytes. *I don't see which way*
 “ *our author would be able to defend his construction*;
 “ for

“ 2^{dly}. None of the *Jewish* writings produced by
 “ him, do assert or imply, that proselytes were in, or so
 “ much as near Christ's time, usually initiated by bap-
 “ tism; which however was what our author should
 “ have prov'd: But on the contrary,

“ 3^{dly}. Some of the Rabbins manifestly speak of that
 “ Christian ceremony, as an invention of St. *John* and
 “ our Saviour; and affirm it expressly to be altogether
 “ new, and not grounded upon any law. From all
 “ which I may safely conclude, that the said *Jewish*
 “ writings are very far from proving what our author,
 “ and the gentleman he transcribes, have undertaken to
 “ establish. For, in short, if any thing is to be col-
 “ lected from 'em, 'tis the contrary to that opinion:
 “ None of 'em say as our author does, that the *Jews*
 “ *before and in our Saviour's time*, us'd to baptize
 “ their proselytes; but some, as I have shewn you,
 “ directly assert, that this initiatory ceremony was not
 “ practis'd till St. *John's* and *Christ's* appearance,
 “ whom they make to be the first authors of it; so that
 “ it could not be borrow'd from the *Jews*. And as
 “ to any later practices of this bewilder'd people, they
 “ can be of no use to illustrate our Lord's design in the
 “ institution. And indeed, 'tis at best a very odd at-
 “ tempt, to put so violent an interpretation on our
 “ Lord's words, merely from the authority of the
 “ Rabbins.

“ But

“ But in answer to Mr. *Wall*’s arguing from the
 “ *Jewish* writings, I have this further to say, that if the
 “ Rabbins had universally asserted in so many words,
 “ *That the Jews always did use to initiate their pro-*
 “ *selytes by baptism; and that St. John and Jesus Christ*
 “ *borrowed the ceremony from them; I should neverthe-*
 “ *less think it the greatest folly and madness in the*
 “ *world, to believe it on their sole authority. All who*
 “ *are acquainted with the Jews know, it is not with-*
 “ *out very good reason that I say this; for they are a*
 “ *despicable, ignorant, and whimsical sort of writers,*
 “ *whose credit is at the lowest ebb imaginable.”*
 The proof of which you may see at large in the learned
 Dr. *Gale*’s reflections on Dr. *Wall*’s, &c. from p. 335.
 to p. 353. where he concludes, “ Since then the *Jews*
 “ and their writings are so much to be distrusted, and
 “ are so scandalous and fallacious, can what they say
 “ be call’d with any prudence? *The true basis of infant*
 “ *baptism?* ----- What is built upon this basis, is
 “ a Rabbinical tradition,.... and one of those washings
 “ which our Lord condemns; but not a Christian
 “ baptism.

Mr. *Emlyn*’s strongest argument for its antiquity is in
 p. 434. ‘ Had it not been *in use* before Christ’s time, I
 ‘ cannot suppose it would ever have become a custom
 ‘ among the *Jews* afterward. Would they begin to pro-
 ‘ selyte persons to their religion by baptism, in imitation
 ‘ of the disciples of *Jesus* of *Nazareth*, whom they held
 ‘ accursed?’ which, if allow’d, will not prove it prac-
 tised before our *Saviour*’s time, because after his death
 they might adopt this ceremony into their religion with
 some alterations from the disciples of *John the Baptist*;
 for all the *Jewish* people held *John* as a prophet, as both
 the scripture and *Josephus* testify.⁴ But I have assigned
 another reason for this invention of the Rabbins, p. 34.
 However, let their baptism be taken up on what occasion
 soever, I think I have proved from the holy scripture,
 which is worth 10000 authorities from the Rabbins,
 that it could not be so early as our *Saviour*; and if we
 set aside this fable, the whole scheme which is built
 upon it, both for the baptizing of infants, and for the
 laying aside of all baptism in Christian nations, must
 needs fall to the ground.

2dly.

³ Dr. Hammond’s *six queries*, p. 195. *Margin*.

⁴ Matth. xxi. 26. *Josephus’s Jewish Antiqu.* xviii. 5, 2.

2dly. If his rule of understanding our Lord's commission by the practice of the *Jews* be right,---it will then follow, ^s“ 1. That none but those who are first circumcised must be baptized, none but such having been baptized amongst them; and the *Jewish* usage is as much our rule in one case, as in the other.” So that all the nations would have been made *Jews* instead of Christians; contrary to *Acts* xv. 1 *Cor.* vii. 18. *Gal.* v. 1 to 6. “ And so all the trifling ceremonies the *Jews* tell us of concerning their pretended baptism, must be used amongst Christians. 2. There must be three judges constituted to be present at the baptism; and the absence of any one of them must render the baptism null and void.” 3. *The person to be baptized went into the water alone, and baptized himself without any administrator.* 4. *The children of proselytes were baptized on their parents assent, without their own till 12 or 13 years of age; which is what no Pædobaptist will approve.* And “ 5. By the same rule likewise children unborn are to be thought to partake of the baptism their mothers received when big with them;” *contrary to the canon of Neocæsaria*, p. 56. “ But to omit other lesser matters, fornication, adultery, incest, and the most abominable vices, will be introduced into the Christian church; and all natural and voluntary ties and relations between men will be dissolved, and the utmost confusion and disorder spread throughout the Christian world: For according to the *Jews*, he that was baptized became another person, and was therefore no longer under any former ties and obligations, and all natural relation was destroyed and washed away; and therefore he renounced his kindred and family, and was pretended to receive even a new soul. . . .

“ The *Jews* do expressly teach, that together with these natural relations between parents and children, husbands and wives, brothers and sisters, all the duties of each were to cease likewise; that marriages were by this baptism dissolved, and each party at liberty to enter upon new contracts, and consequently such as cohabited afterwards were guilty of adultery, and their off-spring were bastards; and that persons not standing in the same relation to one another, nor indeed being the same persons they were before, might lawfully marry any of their former kindred and relations,

O

^s Dr. Gale's *Sermons*, Vol. II. p. 224, 225, 226.

" lations, and even their own mothers, sisters, or daughters. Upon this foot therefore it was wrong in *St. Paul* to censure, as he did, the incestuous *Corinthian*, who had more to say in his own justification, than could easily or fairly be answer'd: Or rather let me observe by the way, that it is manifest from the apostle's words, *1 Cor. v. 1.* that in his time there was no such baptism among the *Jews* which could dissolve all ties; for he calls this an instance of such fornication, as is not so much as named amongst the *Gentiles*. He mentions the *Gentiles* as the worst sort of people; and therefore tacitly affirms more strongly, that it was to be sure not countenanced among the *Jews*: And consequently this *Jewish* baptism, and its efficacy, were not known in that time.

" But to proceed: As this *Jewish* baptism is an inlet of the most abominable impurity and uncleanness, so it is likewise of breach of faith, perjury, and all manner of injustice; for according to them, it frees men from all obligations and contracts, promises and oaths: He who has borrowed, is after baptism not the same person, nor under the same obligations, and therefore need not restore, nor pay any just debt he has contracted. But far be it from any Christian to surmise, that our Saviour instituted this baptism to serve such base, unjust, and abominable purposes. The *Jews* do most certainly, fully, and expressly teach all these things concerning their baptism: And therefore, indeed, if it was practised in our Saviour's time, and adopted by him into his church, and we must account our Christian baptism the same with the *Jewish*, or judge of and regulate ours by theirs in one case, we must in all; and then our baptism likewise must be thought, and our Saviour design'd it should, like theirs, dissolve all manner of ties, and obligations, and engagements. But as this will by all be acknowledged to be absurd and ridiculous, and an unworthy blasphemy against Christ and his gospel, it shews that this way of arguing from the baptism among the *Jews*, is utterly wrong and inconclusive.

3dly. Had our Saviour borrowed his baptism from the *Jews*, yet it would not follow that the *Jewish* and *Christian* baptism must correspond in all respects; because our Lord might not adopt it entirely; and that he really did not, appears from the differences which I have just now mentioned.

mentioned. And if the *Jewish* baptism is so different from that instituted by our Saviour, it can be of no service for explaining our Lord's commission; because after these differences shewn, it cannot reasonably be pretended that our Lord, by his general command to teach and baptize, intended, Go teach and baptize according to the known usage of the *Jews*; and thereby left them to understand it of their practising it under the like rules, and upon the like subjects, as was usual among the *Jews*: For Christ's baptism, in the New Testament, was plainly intended to be practised under different rules, and to different subjects, from the *Jewish*. And if they differed in so many particulars as I have shewn, they might do so in more; and therefore we ought not to stretch our Saviour's words, *Go teach all nations, baptizing them*, beyond their natural signification, barely to make a correspondence between the *Jewish* and *Christian* baptism; where (if our Lord did borrow his baptism from the *Jews*) he might design none, and probably never intended any, having never discovered any such design thro' the whole New Testament: And therefore for any to take this for granted, is a mere begging the question.

What Mr. Emlyn says on 1 Cor. vii. 14. *Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy*: "That by being holy, is meant that such children are not in the state of Heathens, but *born members of the christian church*," is not true; because then the apostle must affirm the unbelieving wife, whom he pronounces sanctified, *i. e.* made holy, to be a church member too. And his sense is expressly contrary to what *Tertullian* says, *men are not born but made Christians*. As to Rom. xi. 16. which Mr. Emlyn has put in his title, *If the root be holy, so are the branches*, the reader can never imagine that the posterity of the *Jews* (of whom the apostle speaks) are holy by birth in any such sense, as that, on their conversion to christianity, they need not be baptized; and if 'tis any kind of holiness which don't render baptism needless, 'tis nothing to the question.

Thus much I have thought fit to say in answer to this hypothesis, which, I find, some dissenting ministers begin to take up with; to whose consciences I appeal, desiring to know how they dare pretend to baptize a child, in a solemn manner, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, whilst they believe it was the will of God and Christ, that none of the children

of Christian parents should ever be baptized. But, as to the ordinance of baptism, I have shewn, *p.* 7, 8, 9. that the commission belongs only to believers, and confirmed the same from the general and particular instances recorded in scripture of persons baptized; and, in *p.* 14, 15, 16, I have given the reasons why it extends to every believer, together with the great benefit which it is of to all such as come to it in the answer of a good conscience. The moral obligation likewise which every believer is under to submit unto it, and the use baptism and the Lord's supper are of to promote true piety and strict virtue, as well as to secure us from superstition and infidelity, have been hinted, *p.* 67, 68. All which, if duly considered with what I have here said, I hope will be sufficient to put a stop to this groundless conceit, That baptism was not design'd to be perpetual, but was only for proselytes, and the children they had before conversion. And if 'tis also entertained by any of the established church, I do not much doubt their giving it up, because, from the frequent and open concessions they make us, we have most reason to expect from *them* a reformation from infant-sprinkling, and other corruptions of Christianity; especially since such a reformation seems earnestly desired by some of their greatest and most learned prelates. Bishop *Burnet*, on the 39 articles, very justly observes, That "an institution of Christ's must not be alter'd or violated upon the account of an inference that is drawn to conclude it needless: He who instituted it, knew best what was most fitting, and most reasonable; and we must chuse rather to acquiesce in his commands, than in our own reasonings." And the author of *The Plain Account*, &c. says, "In a word, I have endeavoured to represent one of our Lord's institutions in its original-simplicity; and if what I have done shall prove at all successful in removing any error, or superstition, from this part of Christianity, I shall esteem my pains well bestowed. The best preservative against the chief attempts of unbelievers, I am persuaded, is to shew the religion of Christ to the world as he left it; and the greatest service to Christianity, is to remove from it whatever hinders it from being seen as it really is in itself. Nor can I think any time more truly seasonable to guard against superstition of any sort, than when infidelity is making its efforts; which is ever seen to draw its main strength from the extravagancies and weaknesses of Christians, and not from the declarations of Christ or his apostles.

N. B.

N. B. It cannot fairly be supposed, that baptizing the posterity of Christians began, or could ever be introduced into the Christian church, in any age since the apostles, and no Christian writer of those times either plead for or against the practice. And the reader is desired to take notice, That Mr. *Emlyn* assures us, p. 430. "The great ground of this my doubt arises from that fundamental proof of infant-baptism, taken from the use of baptism among the *Jews*, by which proselytes were wont to be initiated, as 'tis set forth in Mr. *Wall's* history of baptism, which has put me upon this essay." This great ground of his whole reasoning hath been sufficiently answered: and as he is pleased to say, p. 456. "I am not dogmatical, nor positive in the matter, but only propound it as a problem: nor will I violently defend it, but shall be altogether as well pleased to see my argument fairly confuted, as any one shall be to undertake it:" therefore I hope he will not be displeased with what I have here offered to the public in answer to him; especially as I am one of them, who, as he allows, can truly say, I have no interest, party, nor prejudice to serve. I flatter no party, I look to gain by none: *for as I was never bred to nor concerned in the ministry, I have no fear of displeasing any person to bias my judgment.*

Q U E R Y,

WHETHER upon this new hypothesis it was not absolutely necessary, in order to prevent baptizing the posterity of Christian parents, and to secure the Christian church from receiving into her communion the posterity of unbaptized persons, That every man and woman should have kept an exact genealogy of their descent from the first convert in their family; and also an account of the church into which, and the name of the minister by whom they were baptized? [This might have helped the *Romish* clergy to make out their claim to a lineal and uninterrupted succession, and regular *ordination* derived from the apostles.] And whether, as no such registers have ever been kept, it doth not conclude very strongly against this new conceit?

I SHALL

I SHALL now, pursuant to my promise, take some farther notice of a pamphlet (which came out about three or four months after the third edition of this supplement) entitled, *A just rebuke to our perfidious and false brethren*, &c. which is so very mean and contemptible, that I persuade myself, there is not a judicious man of any denomination, who thinks it deserves a particular answer: Nor will any of the Pædobaptists thank the author for his service; for if what he says, p. 7, 8, 18, 28, 29. be true, it should seem that neither *Luther, Calvin, Zuinglius, Bullinger, Melancthon*, nor their disciples and followers in any age or country since, have ever been able to defend their practice against the Anti-pædobaptists. And all which he hath advanced amounts to no more than this; *That if we are wrong in baptizing infants, you and we also are wrong in assembling together on the first day of the week for publick worship; in admitting women to the Lord's supper, &c.* But what is all this to the purpose, unless there be no more proof from scripture for these things, than there is for infant-sprinkling? That we have scripture for them, has been shewn already, and therefore there is no reason for us to give into his unscriptural practice of infant-sprinkling, because we observe the first day of the week, and admit women to the Lord's supper. Nay, tho' we were not able to maintain our practice in these things by scripture, this would only be a reason for giving up them; but none at all for receiving infant-sprinkling. We shall nevertheless be right in opposing it, if we can prove that there is no scripture evidence but only for our way of baptizing adult persons by dipping.

Instead therefore of making these objections, he would have done better to answer my arguments from scripture and antiquity; but this he has not attempted to do, nor does he so much as pretend to have any the least authority from divine revelation, for what he sometimes calls that *Holy ordinance of infant-baptism*, and which, he says, we *love and choose profanely to call infant-sprinkling*. By the way, if it be a profane thing to call infant-sprinkling by its proper name, why does he so frequently do it himself? Is it not more profane in him, to call that *an holy ordinance*, which is no other than a corrupt invention of men, set up in the room of the sacred institution of Christ?

But

But tho' he meddles not with scripture or antiquity, yet one argument he has, p 29. by which he vainly pretends to overthrow all our arguments from both. " This is the answer, which I have thought most fit and proper (at this time) to give to all their arguments and quotations against infant baptism, and in favour of their mode of baptizing by dipping, (*viz.*) they have been always levelled against, and carried on in opposition to all the most able and faithful ministers of Christ, and have greatly hindred the success of his gospel, and therefore cannot be of God, as they themselves will find to their cost when God shall come to deal with them, *Ezek. xxii. 14.*" This our author looks upon as a mighty argument, and therefore has repeated it by bits and scraps, much oftner than there are pages in his pamphlet. But the question is not whom we oppose, but whether we have truth on our side. The scripture is the Christian's rule of faith, and if we have this for our practice, neither the number nor the learning of them whom we oppose is to be regarded. The majority is too commonly on the side of error, as well as on the side of vice; and it so happens, that this formidable argument has been chiefly used by them who have been in the wrong. The learned among the *Jews*, and the major part of the people, were against Christ and his disciples: and therefore some just as wise as the Rebuker asked, *Have any of the rulers, or of the Pharisees believed in him?* The heathens no less sagely pleaded antiquity, learning and number against the Christians; who were nevertheless in the right, as our Rebuker himself will confess, tho' they were unlearned, fewer in number, and meaner in circumstances than their opposers. Upon the reformation from Popery this notable argument was revived, and very plausibly urged against Protestants. *Where*, said the Papists, *was your religion before Luther?* and exclaim'd against Protestants for presuming to oppose *all the learned, able, faithful, godly and orthodox ministers* of the church of Rome. Let the Rebuker then make the best of his argument, it will have no greater force against us, than it had against the primitive Christians, and the first reformers from Popery.

But tho' he is so grossly defective in point of argument, I must do him the justice to confess, that he has shewn a notable talent for railing and calling names. His whole pamphlet is chiefly made up of rant and repeated calumnies.

calumnies. He grossly misrepresents facts, either thro' ignorance, or ill-will; one or both of which he must possess in an eminent degree, or else he would not have abused, reviled and cursed a great body of Christians in so base a manner.

1st. He insinuates that the Baptists have always appeared the friends of Popery, and warm advocates for Antichrist, p. 1, 6, 19, 26. But nothing can be more false and absurd, they having always been most zealous opposers of it, and endured the most fierce and cruel persecutions for their steady regard to truth, many centuries before the first Protestant Pædobaptists made any appearance, or had so much as a being in the world. For to our churches most properly belongs what Mr. Chandler says, p. 25. of his sermon, "The doctrine of our church was in the writings of the inspired apostles, where theirs is never to be found; 'twas the same as was taught by Christ himself, whom they have forsaken, and whose faith they have corrupted. And as to the professors of our doctrines, they were to be found amongst those martyrs and confessors, whose blood their church hath cruelly spilt; who had from their bishops and clergy, and monks, like the antient worthies, *the trial of cruel mockings and scourgings, and bonds, and imprisonment; who were stoned, sawn asunder, slain with the sword, wandering about, thro' their perfidiousness and cruelty, being destitute, afflicted and tormented, of whom the world was not worthy, wandering in deserts, and in mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth.* We willingly acknowledge these were our predecessors, even these persecuted disciples of the crucified Jesus; who protested against the abominations of their church, and were put to death by them for the testimony of Jesus." And since the time that *Luther, Calvin*, and other reformers came off from the church of *Rome*, whenever we have either wrote or disputed against Protestant Pædobaptists, it has only been against the Popery of such Protestants, but never against their Protestant principles.

2^{dly}. The Rebuker, in order to render our whole interest odious, and to stir up the passions of people against us, has in a malicious and unrighteous manner charged us with persecuting the Protestants ever since the reformation. "Which, saith he, p. 18, of the most famous Protestant divines, and greatest reformers, have

“ have not your fathers, the Anabaptists, of the last
 “ and former generations, persecuted by resisting and
 “ opposing them, and hindering them both in the
 “ work of their ministry, and also in carrying on the
 “ work of reformation? and you of the present genera-
 “ tion, have been always engaged in the same pernici-
 “ ous designs.” But to which side the charge of perse-
 cution most justly belongs, let the whole world judge.
 Who persecuted in *Switzerland*? Did the Anti-pædo-
 baptists persecute the reformers (as the Rebuker calls the
 Pædobaptist Protestants) or were they not the very refor-
 mers, who cruelly persecuted the Anti-pædobaptists?
 Did not *Zuinglius* pronounce this sentence against them?
Qui iterum mergit mergatur, Let him who re-baptizes be
drowned. By virtue of which, and some consequent
 edicts, many Anti-pædobaptists were put to death by
 those warm zealots for infant baptism. Who burnt *Mi-*
thael Servetus the Anti-pædobaptist, but *John Calvin* the
 Pædobaptist? Did not bishop *Cranmer*, *Ridley* and some
 other Pædobaptist ministers, solicit, and prevail with
 pious king *Edward VI.* to put to death *Geo. Van Parr*,
 and *Joan Bocher* called *Joan of Kent*, two Anti-pædo-
 baptists? “ But (as bishop *Burnet* says) it was very hard
 “ to persuade the king to sign the warrant for their exe-
 “ cution; he thought it was an instance of the same
 “ spirit of cruelty, for which the reformers condemn’d
 “ the Papists: and the bishop’s arguments did rather
 “ silence than satisfy the young king; he sign’d the
 “ warrant with tears in his eyes, and said to *Cranmer*,
 “ that since he resign’d up himself in that matter to his
 “ judgment, if he sinned in it, it should lye at his
 “ door. And he adds, These things cast a great blemish
 “ on the reformers; it was said, they only condemn’d
 “ cruelty, when it was exercised on themselves, but
 “ were ready to practise it, when they had power.
 “ The Papists made great use of this afterwards in
 “ queen *Mary’s* time, and what *Cranmer* and *Ridley*
 “ suffered in her time, was thought a just retaliation on
 “ them from that wise providence, that dispenses all
 “ things justly to all men.”

And after the reformation was establish’d, who were
 the persecutors in queen *Elizabeth’s*, king *James*, and
 king *Charles* the first’s time, but the Pædobaptists of the
 Episcopal way? And after the death of that prince, when
 Pædobaptists of another denomination had got the power

into their own hands, did they not also persecute their Anti-pædobaptist brethren? They imprison'd and starved in goal great numbers of them; and were sorry, as appears from *Edwards's Gangræna* and other books of that kind, that it was not in their power to do them more mischief; which they heartily strove to effect: And this cruelty of theirs against the Anti-pædobaptists was not a sudden eruption of their intemperate zeal against us, nor was there any provocation given them, but it was after a mature deliberation of two or three years; for the ordinance of parliament, on which this persecution was founded, *was first drawn up, twice read in the house of commons, referr'd to a committee, and divers days debated; after which it was by some person printed in 1645, or the beginning of 1646, and was very much opposed, and the evil and wickedness of it laid open in many pamphlets by the writers of those times, to stop if it were possible, the houses proceeding in it, particularly in 38 queries upon it; the pretended answer to which was printed 1646, a long time after the queries were published. And the ordinance itself was so far stopt, that it could not be carried into a law till the 2d of May, 1648, when it was ordained, "That all, and every*
" person or persons, that shall publish or maintain.....
" that the baptizing of infants is unlawful, or such bap-
" tism is void, and that such persons ought to be bap-
" tized again; and in pursuance thereof, shall baptize
" any person formerly baptized,..... in case the party
" accused of publishing and maintaining of any of the
" said errors, shall be thereof convicted to have published
" and maintained the same as aforesaid, by the testimo-
" ny of two or more witnesses upon oath, or confession
" of the said party, before two of the next justices of
" the peace,..... the party so convicted, shall be order'd
" by the said justices to renounce his said errors, in the
" publick congregation of the same parish from whence
" the complaint doth come, or where the offence was
" committed; and in case he refuseth or neglecteth to
" perform the same, at or upon the day, time, and
" place appointed by the said justices, then he shall be
" committed to prison by the said justices until he shall
" find two sufficient sureties..... that he shall not main-
" tain or publish the said error or errors any more, &c.
" Ordered by the Lords assembled in parliament, that
" this ordinance be forthwith printed and published.

" John Brown, Cler. Parliamentor."

With

With what face therefore the Rebuker can so much as name the Anti-pædobaptists as persecuting the reformers and their successors ever since, I cannot conceive; when neither he, nor any man else can produce an instance of any such thing; nay, when on the contrary 'tis evident we have been always the sufferers, and the Pædobaptists the persecutors.

But perhaps when the Rebuker is rightly understood, all his outcry of persecution will dwindle into nothing more, than our endeavours to convince them by writing and conference of their mistake with respect to infant baptism; for what he calls *persecuting* them, he here and elsewhere seems to explain by the more moderate expressions of *opposing* and *resisting* them: and in particular he says, p. 8. " Ever since the beginning of the reformation here in *England*, they have made sad work for our greatest reformers, and for those gospel ministers that have succeeded them hitherto; they have always been to them as goads in their sides, a sore scourge and hindrance to them, by their continual assaults made upon them by writings, by challenges, by disputings and triumphs for victory, even more than *Lewis le Grand* ever made in all his glory." And with respect to the *Salters-Hall* Lecturers, p. 4. " That *we* have unexpectedly appear'd from behind the curtain, and in so bold and daring a manner set upon them, and by a sort of legerdemain, turn'd all their arguments against Popery, against themselves." From whence the *persecution* of which the Rebuker complains, seems to be only our urging plain and forcible arguments for their conviction; without our ever using the sword, or persecuting in any manner. But how aukward do such heavy and loud complaints come from a party which have been guilty of a *persecution* the most unchristian, and most grievous to be born. And why our endeavours to convince persons of their mistakes should be deem'd *persecution* I know not; since they are instances not of enmity but charity, and proofs not of an evil but of our good and friendly disposition towards them. And yet this is our grand crime! This is what the Rebuker calls our *persecution of the reformers*, and our *opposing* and *resisting* the *able*, and *godly*, and *orthodox ministers of Christ*. 'Tis true as the Rebuker says, several of the reformers have by way of argument been opposed by the Anti-pædobaptists; and on that account

they have been very angry, and made heavy complaints of us as a troublesome set of people: But this seems to me to argue nothing more than that they very sensibly felt the weight of our arguments, which is no sign that we have either a weak or a bad cause. In this way the Anti-pædobaptists have been very troublesome to the Pædobaptists, whether reformed or Papists, *viz.* by proposing arguments to them which they could not answer. And if this is what the *Rebeker* calls our *persecuting them*, we glory in it, and wish rather for the sake of our adversaries than of ourselves, that we had never suffered any other kind of persecution from them.

3dly. The *Rebeker* has not only unjustly accused us of *persecution*, and of being *friends* to *Popery*, but he has also set us forth as a vile and impious people, such as the judgments of God have always pursued, and made dreadful examples of divine displeasure; which every man who opposeth infant sprinkling must assuredly expect, *p.* 16, 18, 19, 23, 25, 26, 29, 30. In *p.* 18 he says “*Ye do always resist the Holy Ghost; as your fathers did, so do ye*; as your fathers, the Anabaptists “ of the last and former generations, ever since the “ beginning of the reformation have done, so do ye of “ the present generation. And *p.* 19, 20. But God “ will deal with them in his own time and way, as “ he did with *Korah* and his company, and as he hath “ always done with all other proud despisers and contemners of his people and faithful ministers in all “ ages. I will mention but one instance; and that is, “ one of their own brethren, Mr. *John Child*, an Anabaptist minister; what a fearful example of divine “ displeasure did God make of him, for a like case with “ this of theirs, (*viz.*) publishing a book unjustly reflecting on some of God’s ministers and people.”

But what does he mean by bringing this instance, and representing it as a parallel case? Have I written against ministers of the same denomination as he did, or have I *maliciously reviled* them I wrote against? If he would insinuate into his readers, that Mr. *Child* fell into despair for writing a book against infant sprinkling, or against those ministers who practise it, while he remained in the communion of the Baptists, nothing can be more disingenuous or more false. For,

1. On the contrary, the principal cause of his horror and despair was a book which he wrote against dissenters after

after he conformed to the establish'd church, which is sufficiently plain from the true narrative of his life and deplorable death. The title of his book was, "A second argument for a more full and firm union amongst all good Protestants; wherein the Nonconformists taking the sacrament after the manner of the church of *England* is justified, &c." He acknowledged that he wrote it in malice, by the instigation of the devil, from very ill principles of pride, vain glory, and hypocrisy, and when he was asked by Mrs. M. What is the cause of all this trouble? "he answer'd, that cursed book, p. 28.

2. He did not act from conscience when he left the Baptists, but forsook what he believed to be true, and embraced what he knew to be false, from an unreasonable disgust against some persons,⁷ who did not think fit to chuse him for their minister, but chiefly, because he was afraid of persecution. For being asked, What do you think of *Spira's* condition? "*Spira's* condition, said he, was nothing to mine; for wrath is come, and coming on me to the utmost, because I have forsaken that which I believed to be true, to embrace that which I knew to be false, thro' slavish fear to keep my self from sufferings.--- I sought to be great in the world, but God crost me therein in all my designs, p. 27." At another time, "After some reasonings about baptism, conformity, and the troubles which Nonconformists were under, (he said) I have abundance of carnal fleshly reasonings, I am under the power of unbelief and distrust; for these are my arguings in me: Should I stick to the church of *England*, then those I have written against, would count me the greatest hypocrite in the world, to make so much ado about despair, for what I have done against them; should I leave the church of *England*, and stick to the dissenters, and with full purpose of heart cleave to the Lord, then, if ever I am taken in a meeting, they will have no mercy on me, and triumph, This is the man who made his recantation, and then ruin me to all intents and purposes; and I cannot bear the thoughts of a cross, nor a prison, p. 20."

⁷ See the Answer to Mr. Child's Book, by James Jones, p. 2, 14. entitled Modesty and Faithfulness, in opposition to Envy and Rashness. Printed 1683.

3. God's ministers, whom he unjustly reflected on, were not for infant sprinkling; but some ministers of the Baptist persuasion, whose opinion about the decrees of God he did not approve even at last. For when *T. P.* exhorted him to remember the goodness of God to mankind, *Mr. Child* answer'd, "That is a truth
 " still, but I cannot lay hold on it; and by how much
 " the more I have believed and asserted it, so much the
 " greater is my sin and the aggravation of my con-
 " demnation, *p.* 31."

But yet he was greatly troubled, because he thought he had "strain'd their opinions beyond their intentions,
 " and drawn such consequences as never were in their
 " minds; and, striking his breast with much anguish,
 " said, These words lie close; I shall never get over
 " this; I writ in prejudice against them, calling them
 " a villainous body of people, which was unjust, *p.* 18.

These few passages which I have here transcribed from the true narrative, &c. are to be found verbatim in that account of *Mr. Child*, out of which the Rebuker took all his quotations. 'Tis bound up with the relation of the fearful estate of *Francis Spira*, excepting his reply to *Mr. T. P.* *p.* 31. which is omitted. And I think all the persons who are therein mention'd, as visiting and discoursing with *Mr. Child*, and who so earnestly persuaded him to write a recantation of that book which caused his despair, were Baptists; which plainly shews what regard he hath for truth, and how far his representation of facts ought to be believed; where he says, "What a dreadful example of divine displeasure did God make of him, for a like case with this of theirs!" Namely, this supplement written against infant sprinkling. I am surpriz'd to think how he durst offer to impose upon the publick in such a manner, and then to add *p.* 22. "Thus much I thought would
 " be very fit and useful to transcribe; but for the rest,
 " I refer you to the printed book." Tho' like one conscious of his crime, he has carefully concealed the title of it, as if he feared some of his readers might examine it, and detect his falshood. But every honest man must abhor such a conduct, when they are assured that the *True Narrative of the life and deplorable end of Mr. John Child*, was drawn up by those of the Baptist persuasion; and is attested to by two of their ministers, *Mr. Thomas Plant* and *Mr. Benjamin Dennis*; and that

[III]

that Mr. *Child's* apostatizing from the truth we profess, and afterwards reviling us by publishing his second argument, appears to be the sole cause of his despair. See the preface and the work at large. And therefore this case of Mr. *John Child* is so far from answering the Rebuker's design, that on the contrary it rather stands as a warning, that no man should desert our communion, and afterwards revile us.

Before I conclude, I must take notice of one thing which relates to myself in particular. In *p. 4.* our author concludes, " That this Supplement was the secret " and mischievous contrivance of the whole conclave, " and not of any one single person ;" and therefore I am obliged to inform the publick, that if there be any mischief or errors in it, the blame thereof ought to rest wholly upon myself, because I never communicated my intentions to, nor advised with any man of our whole interest until I had finished my design ; and then (as I think every wise man would choose to do before he sent any thing abroad) I desired a learned and judicious friend or two to examine it, and point out whatever they thought amiss: [if the author of the Rebuke had done the same, 'twould certainly have died in manuscript] and therefore no man ought to think that in reading this Supplement he has the strength of our whole interest ; for from them the world might justly expect something much more considerable: Tho' if this tract could possibly receive any reputation from the author of the Rebuke, the world might be apt to think it a masterly work, " Better done..... than " all the Jesuits in *Europe* could have done it for " themselves, and with a much better grace. A curious, soft, fine-spun, artful pretence throughout, written by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, &c. so that all the Jesuits in *Rome* and *Hell* could never have defended their own cause themselves so artfully, so seasonably, so successfully, and with so good a grace, *p. 2, 20, 28.*" Thus he runs on in a repetition of the same rude stuff from page to page ; without either decency, or argument.

The E N D.

